THE ART OF COOKERY: A CULINARY SEARCH FOR CULTURAL AND NATIONAL IDENTITY IN GREAT BRITAIN, 1750-1850

A Thesis

by

ELIZABETH MURIEL SCHMIDT

Submitted to the Office of Graduate and Professional Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Chair of Committee,	James Rosenheim
Committee Members,	Troy Bickham
	Margaret Ezell
Head of Department,	David Vaught

May 2014

Major Subject: History

ABSTRACT

This thesis discusses how published cookbooks reflect the complicated attitudes toward identity in Great Britain between 1750 and 1850. Focusing on cookbooks produced as commercial products, we are able to see how gender, national, and regional identity was expressed through the introductory pages of a cookbook as well as the recipes that were included. The gendered differences in professional training in Britain resulted in two very different categories of published cookbooks. Male-authored books were more appreciative of foreign cuisine, since these authors had technical training in France's *nouvelle cuisine*. Since women most often gained their knowledge of cooking through experiences as housewives or housekeepers, the female-authored cookbooks more overtly expressed the development of a British national identity. This contributed to the overall trend of anti-French sentiment into the nineteenth century through cookbook introductions and the exclusion of French recipes, especially as Anglo-French tensions reached high points during this period. A paradox existed as the middling classes expressed loyalty to the nation while also conforming to the current fashion of French cuisine. Within the culinary world authors tried to satisfy the middle class by including French recipes in their cookbooks while also touting their loyalty to Britain and their preference for "British" cuisine.

However, even though nationalistic sentiment increased during periods of intense commercial and political competition with France, regional distinctions never disappeared from the British Isles. This project shows that although a unique "British"

identity was forming during the eighteenth and nineteenth century, British subjects retained regional distinctions such as Scottish, Irish and Welsh. Published cookbooks show both a decrease in French recipes and an increase in regionally distinctive recipes over the course of a century. By the end of the Napoleonic Wars, French cuisine had been equated with expense and ostentation, gaining a very negative view in the eyes of cookbook authors. At the same time though, recipes reflected distinct regional influences, illustrating the importance of maintain cultural distinctions. Rather than a homogenization of British culture, or the conflation of "English" and "British," the various cultures within Great Britain maintained their importance in the eyes of the people.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Between 1750 and 1850 in Great Britain cookbooks were designed to make the lives of housewives, housekeepers, and cooks easier. As author Hannah Glasse phrased it, the goal of the books were "to improve the Servants, and save the Ladies a great deal of Trouble."[1] Beyond their contemporary purpose, cookbooks offer us a look at the the political, economic, and social cultures of Great Britain during the eighteenth and nineteenth century. Analyzing expressions of different ideas through the preparation and consumption of different food tells us stories of cookery, consumption, economics, politics, societal norms, and much more. It is through these stories that we understand how identity was shaped and affected at a certain point in time. Using an analysis of how recipe titles change over time, increases in the use of specific ingredients, how authors are portrayed, and the language of instruction readers can draw conclusions about how people expressed specific identities. In Britain, cookbooks can help us understand the complex relationship between gender, nationalism, and regional uniqueness. The transition between the eighteenth and nineteenth century encompassed many events which influenced the development of British identity. These include the Seven Years War, the American War for Independence, the 1801 Act of Union, and the Napoleonic Wars. This thesis will look at twenty six cookbooks currently available to the author published in Great Britain between 1733 and 1817 to discover how cuisine can be used

[1] Hannah Glasse, The Art of Cookery, Made Plain and Easy (London, 1747), ii.

to help us understand shifts in identity. It will show how the language and presentation of cookbooks evolved over the course of a century, reflecting the changing ways in which gender, national, and regional identities were expressed and changed over time.

This project answers questions not just about culinary history or food history, but also about the history of identity during a period in Great Britain when national loyalty was not always clearly defined. Political fervor was reflected in cookbooks as authors expressed opinions about foreign food during times of war and times of peace. This patriotic expression was very often affected by the gendered experience of an author which is portrayed in the differences between male- and female-authored cookbooks. Finally, this project will discuss how national identity and regional identity were both developing at the same time as the people of Great Britain placed importance on both British patriotism and regional distinctions. Beginning as early as the seventeenth century cookbooks began to evolve from a book of ideas shared amongst professionals to a book of instructions for amateurs. The world of cuisine had been dominated by French innovation, reflected in many of the published cookbooks of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Around 1750 heightened tensions between France and Britain caused a shift in how French cuisine was viewed in published cookbooks: from fashionable to extravagant and unnecessary. Although authors began to use their published works to make their negative opinions known regarding the French, as Hannah Glasse did in the first edition of her book *The Art of Cookery* in 1747, French recipes never disappeared from British cookery books. There were, however, often subtle negative references to the expense and extravagance of French cuisine in comparison to

British cuisine. Even during periods of heightened conflict with France, however, cookbooks also reflected differences between the food of the different British regions. These distinctions tell us that even when "British" patriotism was vital to the political success of the nation, the cultural differences of Britain's various regions were never forgotten.

Intersections between food and identity are important to find because food is, at its core, essential to human life. Although food is something that everyone has in common, it also serves as a marker of social distinction equally for those who prepare it, who write about it, and who consume it. The content of a cookbook, including introductions, instructions, and recipe titles, gives us information about how food could be used to portray distinctions between social classes. Beginning as early as the sixteenth century, "the art of cookery" began to dominate published cookbooks as the great chefs marketed themselves as artists. While food had historically been a medium through which one can entertain and portray power, it was around this time that cookbooks began to shift from being treatises on the scientific benefits of certain foods to emphasizing the artistry behind cuisine. Cookbooks transformed from a guide to basic survival with an emphasis on health and appetite to a manual on how to prepare and present food in an artistic way; the more extravagant and ostentatious the display, the more wealth and social power was displayed. While there has been significant scholarship in the fields of history and anthropology on the role of food systems in society, little work has been done on how cuisine played a part in social and political culture. Culinary histories of

France have been written but we have yet to find a work that significantly addresses how cuisine in Britain was used to express social and political identities.

At the most basic foundation, food is necessary for humans to survive in terms of nourishment. However, each culture has approached how that nourishment takes place differently, with the development of specific national cuisines based on what is available to eat. As empires expanded, cuisine in Europe became more and more diverse with the inclusion of different foods from abroad. Looking at the changes in recipes over time we can see how cookbook authors approached food differently as new ingredients and techniques were introduced. Cookbooks, as expressions of entire culinary systems and not just food, can also tell us how people lived on levels other than the basic. In addition to the use of local or exotic ingredients, rituals of manners and culinary procedures can represent the existence of social hierarchies and were used to show hospitality and power. Identifying how different levels of society use rituals of eating to convey ideas such as power, wealth, and sophistication allows us to understand how food was influential in creating identities. Each section of this thesis deals with a specific type of identity, beginning by showing that the gender of an author can affect the content of a cookbook by emphasizing particular aspects of their training and professional background. The first chapter will show that men, who trained under professional chefs most often stemming from Parisian food guilds, had a very positive opinion of French cuisine. On the other hand, the exclusion of women from these professional circles meant that their more traditional training from family members and confined to the home gave them a negative view of French food. The second chapter will use cookbooks to

show how Anglo-French conflict contributed to national patriotism. Wartime political zeal often led people to overlook the cultural differences within Great Britain through a mutual dislike of France. A criticism of French cuisine and the Anglicization of French recipes reflect a desire to create a common British identity in the face of political tension. Finally, the thesis will end by showing how regionally specific recipes increased over time. Cookbook authors were appealing to an audience that placed more emphasis on regional distinctions by the time the Napoleonic War ended. The cookbooks serve as a reminder that regionalism shouldn't be ignored as national patriotism didn't erase the importance that was placed on regional differences.

When it comes to the history of cuisine in the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries, we must begin with Claude Lévi-Strauss. In his four volume anthology on the science of mythology he provided an approach to cultural meanings based in cultural anthropology. In relation to food, he showed that food taboos, dinner rituals and manners are based in cultural myths about contamination and impurity. Furthermore, their histories and foundations differ based on the culture in which they exist. For example, in *The Origin of Table Manners,* he writes that Italian influence "extended [the French] category of raw" as Italian cuisine opened French eyes to the possibility of serving vegetables raw without any dressing.[2]

Serious scholarship about particular kinds of cuisine, and their cultural connotations, began around the 1980s with culinary histories of France, like Babara

[2] Claude Lévi-Strauss, *The Origin of Table Manners* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1978), 478.

Ketcham Wheaton's book *Savoring the Past*.[3] Similar to the fact that the British adopted French cuisine much later than it was developed in France, histories of British cuisine came later. Because French cuisine was considered to have the greatest influence over what we consider modern cuisine, culinary history had to begin with what the French did and how it permeated throughout the world. Wheaton's book analyzes how French cuisine developed over time between 1300 and 1789, discussing how events in France's political history affected the development and spread of French cuisine to other areas of Europe. She briefly touches on the influence of French cuisine in Britain when she talks about French chefs working in British households to add an air of prestige, especially after the Edict of Nantes was revoked in 1685 and Protestant French chefs were forced to leave France, taking their training with them.[4] Later books on French cuisine, including Sarah Peterson's *Acquired Taste*, also discuss the specific history of French cuisine. These books briefly touch on the impact of French food in Britain but are more generally a culinary history of France specifically. Peterson's book, published in 1994, specifically discusses the medieval and renaissance origins of French cuisine, providing readers with a comprehensive history of how specific ingredients and techniques came to be in French cooking.[5] In 1995, Stephen Mennel published *All Manners of Food*, a history of cuisine in both England and France. His book proves to be mostly a history of French cuisine and its influences, since food in England was so heavily influenced by the French. His book does discuss the English cookery book but only to the extent that even

[3] Barbara Ketcham Wheaton, *Savoring the Past: The French Kitchen and Table from 1300 to 1789* (New York: Scribner, 1983).
[4] Wheaton, *Savoring the Past*, 160-172.
[5] Sarah T. Peterson, *Acquired Taste: The French Origins of Modern Cooking* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994).

the earliest printed cookery books had French influence.[6] Books that have come out specifically on cookery in England are also very heavy on the side of French cuisine, because of the significant influence. Elisabeth Ayrton, C. Anne Wilson, and Kate Colquhoun are three authors who have produced works specifically about cuisine in Great Britain. Ayrton's book, *The Cookery of England* published in 1988, is the story of how traditional English recipes developed over time.[7] Alongside her historical research, Ayrton also provided her readers with several recipes from different periods in England's history. Wilson's *Food and Drink in Britain*, published in 1991, is very similar to Ayrton's, discussing specific items in British cookery books.[8] Her book has an expanded geography, as it includes food and drink items from outside of England and covers Scotland and Ireland as well. Colquhoun, however, took a different approach in her book *Taste: The Story of Britain through its Cooking.*[9] *Taste* has a more global approach, discussing the appearance of new ingredients as Britain's empire expanded. All three of these books still include discussions of the French influence on British cooking. Aside from books discussing specific national cuisines, there are also several that discuss food in Europe more generally, like those by Felipe Fernandez-Armesto or Ken Albala.[10]

---

[6] Stephen Mennell, *All Manners of Food: Eating and Taste in England and France from the Middle Ages to the Present,* (Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 1995), 85.
[7] Elisabeth Ayrton, *The Cookery of England* (New York: Penguin, 1988).
[8] C. Anne Wilson, *Food and Drink in Britain: From the Stone Age to the 19th Century* (Chicago: Academy Publishers, 1991).
[9] Kate Colquhoun, *Taste: The Story of Britain Through Its Cooking* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2007).
[10] Felipe Fernandez-Armesto, *Near a Thousand Tables: A History of Food* (New York: Free Press, 2002); Ken Albala, *Food in Early Modern Europe* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 2003).

Books within the field of culinary history also cover whole culinary systems that surround the consumption of food. Margaret Visser's *The Rituals of Dinner* looks at how the rituals associated with a meal have developed over time in several parts of the world.[11] She discusses how different rituals coincide with changes in social hierarchies and activities in various cultures, and the development of dinner rituals into what we know today. The field also includes works that discuss the history of specific ingredients and their connections to world history, such as Sidney Mintz's *Sweetness and Power*, or Mark Kurlansky's *Salt.*[12] Connections between food and empire, like Colquhoun's *Taste*, are also found within culinary history. Lizzie Collingham's *Curry: A Tale of Cooks and Conquerors* discusses how British colonialism in India put into motion the development of a new "Indian" cuisine based on what the British found appetizing.[13] Troy Bickham's article "Eating the Empire" is on a similar topic but discusses the existence of ingredients and recipes in Britain from the British colonies. Paul Langford's work on how consumption and the Grand Tour influenced British colonies is also relevant to a project like this. Class specific consumption statistics, and the way in which luxury and food contributed to social standing, helps to understand how class identity affected the development of a national identity.[14]

The field of food history includes books written by many different types of others, some academic and some not. Food essays and memoirs are popular books for

---

[11] Margaret Visser, *The Ritual of Dinner: The Origins, Evolution, Eccentricities, and Meaning of Table Manners* (New York: Grove Weidenfeld, 1991).
[12] Sidney Mintz, *Sweetness and Power: The Place of Sugar in Modern History* (New York: Penguin Books, 1985); Mark Kurlansky, *Salt: A World History* (New York: Penguin Books, 2002).
[13] Lizzie Collingham, *Curry: A Tale of Cooks and Conquerors* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002).
[14] Paul Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People: England 1727-1783* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989).

the average reader, often being written by professional chefs or food writers. Although books of this sort occasionally reference the history of a particular ingredient or type of food, more often than not they are based on the writer's personal experience. Mark Kurlansky's books *Salt: A World History* and *Cod: A Biography of the Fish that Changed the World* are insightful looks at how a single item of food could affect world events. Kurlansky's lack of professional historical training, however, means that the books are generally based on only secondary literature with no primary evidence to support the argument. Although these books are not as reliable as those written by a trained academic, they are still worthwhile in that they represent the desire for an understanding of how food has had an influence on history.

National identity is a topic that many authors have already covered, either generally or in relation to a specific place. Benedict Anderson's *Imagined Communities* is one of the most well-known books on nationalism and has sparked plenty of debate within the field.[15] In terms of British nationalism specifically, many authors, such as Linda Colley and Robert Tombs, have produced works that discuss how enmity toward the French created an identity that was specifically "British," eliminating a dependence on regional identities.[16] While books such as these touch briefly on the existence of French cuisine within Great Britain, they do not go into great detail on how this affected popular opinion of either France or Britain. Intersections between the culinary histories and histories of British nationalism do not really exist on their own. That is where works

[15] Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism* (New York: Verso, 2006).
[16] Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707-1837 (*New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992); Isabelle and Robert Tombs, *That Sweet Enemy: The French and the British from the Sun King to the Present* (London: William Heinemann, 2006).

such as this thesis fit in, with a discussion on how changes in cookbooks reflect changes in both British national and regional identity.

This thesis examines and analyzes twenty-six first editions of different cookbooks published in Great Britain. The sample represents areas of Great Britain outside of London as well both female and male authors. The specific dates that the sample covers is 1733 to 1817, and uses only first editions when available. The decision to avoid later editions was made in order to present each cookbook on an equal playing field, focusing on how the text appeared originally rather than including later publication history that altered its original state. For a similar reason, the study focuses only on printed cookbooks instead of including manuscripts because the analysis covers what was marketed to a public audience, not a private compilation of recipes or something that was circulated amongst a select group of people. What we are interested in here is the commercially published books that were available to the average consumer in eighteenth and nineteenth century Britain rather than handwritten manuscripts passed between family and friends. The sample is fairly evenly spread over the time period studied although the representation of male and female authors is less even. The cookbooks looked at here include eleven "male-authored" texts and fifteen "female-authored" texts. This skewed distribution is, however, representative of the period since "female-authored" texts appeared to be more marketable beginning around 1750.

Different from many other genres of books, cookbooks present a problem when it comes to the identities of the authors. As cookbooks are compilations of someone's culinary experience, original authorship of specific recipes is almost impossible to

determine and the identification of these authors is not necessary for a study of this sort. The analysis focuses on whether specific recipes are included in the book and how they are labeled rather than their origin. Furthermore, the name of the author on the title page is not always accurate. Occasionally, publishers would have invented a persona to associate with their cookbook, or they could have taken the book from its original author and expanded on it later without his or her knowledge, yet still using the name of the original author. However, this thesis will focus on the identity of the author that is portrayed, specifically, whether that persona is male or female. For the purposes of this study, texts are either "male-authored" or "female-authored" based on how they are presented to their readership and not necessarily the historical record. Information regarding the identities of various authors will focus on whether they were technically trained to cook or whether they learned by experience; i.e., the majority of male authors build on their qualifications as a professional chef while female authors were apparently more marketable if they had learned to cook through work experience as a housekeeper. Because of this distinction, historical identities of the authors are not as important as the public face of the author in the books for this study.

The type of data collected from these cookbooks falls into three categories: style and prose, recipe titles, and ingredients. The style and prose data encompasses the language used in both the introduction and in the instructions included with the recipes. This language reflects the gender identity and experiential background of the author. The recipe titles reflect where recipes originated and occasionally to whom they are attributed. The change in titles over time indicates how foreign cuisine was presented to

the general public at specific points in time. Combined with the techniques included in the recipe instructions, it can also give hints as to how titles attributed to one kind of cuisine, for example a French *fricasseé,* were often not reflective of the true technique. The final category helps us to understand what ingredients may have been commonplace in a typical British household. Instructions accompanying certain ingredients, such as "obtain some Jamaica pepper," reveal that an author expected readers to use an ingredient but did not necessarily expect them to have it in their kitchen already, and assumed they could obtain it. Comparing the existence of these ingredients in the cookbooks to advertisements in local papers about the availability of such ingredients would lead to a better understanding of when certain spices, fruits, etc. became commonplace in British markets.

The first chapter will deal with how professional identity in the world of food was extremely gendered, as both experience and the sex of the author affected how they approached their audience and what they included in their books. I will first look at the history of cuisine and published cookbooks, highlighting how the vocabulary and experiences within the food profession were determined by gender stereotypes in Great Britain. Then, this chapter will deal specifically with how an author's background and sex dictated the content of the cookbook. An author's background generally affected how much influence French cuisine had on recipes within their books, as men were more likely to have been trained professionally by master cooks who specialized in French cuisine. Food and drink guilds in Britain were most often found in the large urban areas and had similar structures to other craft-guilds that existed. Masters hired apprentices to

teach them skills needed to be successful in food and drink markets. As French cooks left France for various reasons many of them looked for employment in Great Britain. Often they were able to find a place within the food guilds that existed within Britain, training future British cooks in the art of French cuisine. For the most part, guild statutes precluded entry by women and so female cooks were most often trained by their mothers or grandmothers who were more familiar with traditional simpler British cuisine.[17]

The second chapter illustrates the criticism of French cuisine that existed within published cookbooks, detailing how this criticism bolstered British nationalism. France had an unmistakable influence on the social atmosphere of Great Britain as French food, clothing, and manners were considered highly fashionable. However, a desire to appear fashionable was often affected by political struggles that were anti-French. The cookbooks show a shift from a desire to be "fashionable" to the ideal household as "elegant," terms that became associated with France and Britain respectively. "Fashion" came to represent French extravagance and expense while "elegance" was sophistication and frugality. This chapter will first analyze the paradox that occurred between social and political opinions of the French, and how this is expressed through the cookbooks. It will also consider how imperial connections affected the content of the cookbooks and bolstered a view of "Britishness" that was increasingly globalized.

[17] For more information regarding craft-guilds in England, see: Patrick Wallis, "Apprenticeship and Training in Premodern England," *The Journal of Economic History*, 68:3 (2008), pp. 832-861.; Gary Richardson, "A Tale of Two Theories: Monopolies and Craft Guilds in Medieval England and Modern Imagination," *Journal of the History of Economic Thought* 23:2 (2001), pp 217-242.; Clare Crowston, "Women, Gender, and Guilds in Early Modern Europe: An Overview of Recent Research," *IRSH*, 53 (2008), pp. 19-44.

The final chapter will discuss how cookbooks reflect the tendency to conflate "English" with "British" and the tensions between Welsh, Scottish, Irish and English populations. Even as the people of Great Britain were creating a "British" identity, regional identities continued to flourish in the world of food, suggesting that regional distinctions permeated very deeply into British social culture. This chapter will look at how the increase in regionally specific recipes reflect the desire by Britons to emphasize the importance of regional uniqueness. It will use an analysis of instructional language, recipe titles, and publishing history to identify both the penchant for using "English" as a national identifier and the importance placed on differences in regional food.

Most importantly, this thesis will show that while the search for national identity was an ongoing process between 1750 and 1850, it wasn't necessarily a priority on an individual level. The population was actively trying to grapple with developing personal identities while trying to maintain the image of the most powerful country in the world. For political reasons, it was necessary to portray an image of a united Britain. Socially, however, many people were more concerned with discovering their own identities and places within a fractured society. As English was touted as the ideal version of "British," Scots, Irish and Welsh sectors of society were attempting to maintain their own cultural heritage. At the same time, women were trying to gain control over the world of cooking, an area that had traditionally been classified as the private sphere and therefore the place of women, but professionally had been dominated by men. In an age of empire and revolution, developing a consistent national identity seemed to be the focus as the

great European powers lost colonies and gained new ones. At the personal level, however, the priority was discovering one's place within a globalized world.

CHAPTER II

BROTHER AND SISTER COOKS: GENDER AND PROFESSIONAL IDENTITY

French food was impossible to avoid between 1750 and 1850 in Britain. By this point, it had been clearly established as the most popular type of cuisine and most professional chefs had been trained either in French culinary institutions or by a French master. However, this did not necessarily mean that every person employed as a cook in Britain was considered a "professional chef." What this chapter will highlight is the ways in which gender differences plagued the culinary world. Both men and women worked as cooks in what we in modern times would consider a "professional" capacity. However, in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries women were rarely members of professional communities. Instead, when it came to food, women were most often referred to as housekeepers or "cooks" while the terms "professed cooks" or "principal cooks" were reserved for men. The title didn't necessarily mean that men were superior but a clear difference did exist based on gender. Experience, rather than title, was crucial in determining the trajectory of a cook's career. John Perkins, in *The Lady's Assistant,* included an entry for "cook" which he defined as "that servant in whose department is the care of the kitchen in general," and who is repeatedly referred to in the feminine through pronouns like "her" and "she."[1] Some worked in wealthy households, serving the same family for years or moving from place to place. Some took their knowledge

[1] John Perkins, *Every Woman Her Own House Keeper; or the Ladies' Library* (London, 1796), 320.

and experience and trained people in culinary techniques, whether it was in a professional capacity training new cooks or a woman teaching her daughters and granddaughters. Then there were some who took a career's worth of knowledge and wrote cookbooks.[2]

The content of these books was dictated by what the author's experience had taught him or her. In terms of cookbooks, the "author" was most generally a "compiler," bringing together not only original recipes but recipes learned, adapted, and modified through a career in the kitchen. Between the men and women who wrote these cookbooks, there was one very important difference. Because the content was largely influenced by the experience of the author, the content of books authored by men and women differed in terms of what kinds of cuisine they included and how their opinion of different cuisines was expressed. Men, who were professionally trained in French cuisine, generally had a positive view of French food. Women, however, most often had a negative opinion of French food since they were less influenced by technical opinions of the French. Without first-hand experience under a French cook or a technical appreciation of French cuisine, their opinion would be more influenced by public opinion and political views of France as a whole.

Projected audience also affected what kind of recipes were included in a cookbook, whether they were local or foreign, extravagant or simple. In a world where class differences were blurring and the middling classes of the population were

[2] Alan Davidson, ed. *The Oxford Companion to Food* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 158; 213.

constantly looking upward toward the aristocratic sectors of society, the need for knowledgeable household staff became increasingly important. Many cookbook authors in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries recognized this need and wrote for women who were attempting to become proper ladies and needed to purchase a book to educate their employees in the proper method of running a sophisticated household. By the eighteenth century, food began to play a part "in the acts of inclusion and identification, exclusion and rejection by which communities no less than individuals define themselves."[3] Food became one opportunity to emulate the higher social groups of British society. Class differences, gender definitions, and national identity could all be reflected in the act of eating; table manners, meal structure, and menu choices were all indicators in determining social status.[4] Because French food was at the height of fashion, the rising middle class needed to take advantage of experience and knowledge that would help them develop a kitchen centered on French cuisine.

Nouvelle Cuisine and Social Hierarchies in Britain

As *nouvelle cuisine* was developed in France in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, courts around Europe adopted the style in the interest of fashion. King Charles II in England had been particularly inspired by all things French and adopted this new style of court-cookery, along with the French language and manners of

[3] Priscilla Ferguson, "Eating Orders: Markets, Menus, and Meals," *The Journal of Modern History*, 77 (September, 2005): 689.
[4] Stephen Mennell, *All Manners of Food: Eating and Taste in England and France from the Middle Ages to the Present* (Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 1995), 62.

dress.[5] *Nouvelle cuisine* was marked by the use of structured garnishes and sauces, accompaniments that include complex layers of flavor, as opposed to the English tradition of serving roasted meats with plainly cooked vegetables and accompaniments that were more like condiments or gravies. As Anne Willan writes, French recipes disguised their food in butter while the British recipes were more primitive without being transformed by complicated and extravagant sauces.[6] An example of this distinction can be found in Hannah Glasse's *The Art of Cookery* where the very first chapter is titled "Of Roasting, Boiling, &c." The chapter begins with instructions on how to roast certain kinds of meat, followed by more detailed recipes for preparing the roasted meat, and then by listing directions on how to dress and serve various vegetables. The entire chapter is a demonstration of traditional British cooking, devoid of any sauces to accompany the meat and vegetables.[7]

Nouvelle cuisine also included a new style of serving and table manners. Meals included three to four courses, also called services, and reflected a highly structured system of manners. The *service à la Française* began with soups and hors d'oeuvres, moved to roast game and savory dishes, followed by *entremets* which were generally vegetable dishes, and then ended with dessert.[8] Each service included multiple courses with the number of choices being determined by the season and what was available. The

[5]Mennell, *All Manners of Food*, 129-130.; Ann Willan et al., *The Cookbook Library: Four Centuries of the Cooks, Writers, and Recipes That Made the Modern Cookbook* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012), 193.; Davidson, *The Oxford Companion to Food*, 277-279.
[6] Willan, *The Cookbook Library*, 238. See also Isabelle and Robert Tombs, *That Sweet Enemy: The French and British from the Sun King to the Present* (London: William Heinemann, 2006), 104, for more information regarding the use of French cuisine at court.
[7] Hannah Glasse, *The Art of Cookery Made Plain and Easy* (London, 1747), 3-13.
[8] Davidson, *The Oxford Companion to Food*, 713.

services were also influenced by what the French believed to be the best for a person's health during particular seasons. Martha Bradley included a chapter titled "Of the Nature of Foods, and suiting them to Constitutions" expressing her belief that food was responsible for health and appetite for, as she writes, "if sick, [a man] cannot relish his Food."[9] At each service, the choices were laid out on the table for diners to see and choose from. This *service à la Française* was used mostly for formal occasions when the purpose was to make a show of wealth and power. The full service was considered inappropriate for informal dinners, for which fewer choices were generally offered. For the English courts, the full service was very commonly used and up until the eighteenth century the nobles spent much of their time at court with the King. The gentry observed the fashion and put it into place on their own estates for the periods that they were not at court.

After 1714, England was ruled by German kings of the Hanover dynasty who spent less time at court than previous rulers. Although the large banquets and formal occasions still used the *service à la Française,* there were fewer of them as the kings travelled. Since the Hanoverians also reigned in Germany, many of them split their time between the two places, leading to a decline in court culture in Britain. Prior to 1716, monarchs were required to get Parliament's permission to leave the country which had been part of the Act of Settlement in 1701. This section of the act was repealed in 1716 at the request of George I as he had duties to perform outside of Britain. Because the King was not at court, noble families more often retreated to their country estates and

[9] Martha Bradley, *The British Housewife: or, the Cook, Housekeeper's and Gardiner's Companion* (London, 1760), 13-16.

reverted back to a rural existence. The court-style of *nouvelle cuisine* was no longer relevant, and many noble families in England went back into a more traditional style of British cooking.[10]

Even as the nobles withdrew from *nouvelle cuisine*, the fashion still trickled through the social hierarchy into the lower classes. As the rising middle class began to make more money they expressed a desire to run their households in a way that reflected what they believed the gentry was doing. Because of this, it was fashionable for wealthy families to hire French chefs and foreign servants who would lend a "cosmopolitan air" to the household as well as add to their "employer's prestige."[11] For these families food became a "vehicle for anticipatory socialization," as they adopted the manners of the social group they aspired to.[12] For the gentry, however, food was always a means to express social distance from the people of Britain who didn't belong to the landed, noble class. This explains another reason for their departure from *nouvelle cuisine* and relapse back into traditional English ways of preparing and serving food. Eventually, by the 19th century, the aristocratic classes were yet again capitalizing on a new fashion, the *service à la Russe* in which courses only had one option and each dish was served to guests by a servant. This service required more elaborate table decorations, since food was no longer placed in the middle of the table for guests to choose from, as well as requiring more servants to assign one to each guest. This service was not practical for households with little wealth, providing an opportunity for the wealthy classes to create even more social

[10] Kate Coloquon, *Taste: The Story of Britain Through Its Cooking* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2007), 192.
[11] Barbara Ketcham Wheaton, *Savoring the Past: The French Kitchen and Table from 1300 to 1789* (New York: Scribner, 1983), 162-163.
[12] Mennell, *All Manners of Food,* 75.

distance between them and the lower classes.[13] As is the nature of fashion, trends take time to trickle down the ladder of social hierarchies. Although *nouvelle cuisine* was fashionable in the courts and among nobles it did not become popular amongst the majority of the British population until the early parts of the eighteenth century. Although the nobles were already reverting back to traditional British cooking, the sections of the population who wanted to emulate the gentry latched onto *nouvelle cuisine* as a way to express their wealth and sophistication.

If there was one thing that all published cookbooks during this period had in common it was their audience. The emerging middle class, and the increased tendency of their aspirations to lead them up social ladders, was the perfect market for instructional cookbooks. Because of ambiguity of social standing, it is impossible to say that the entire middle class was at an equal social level. In the most general sense the middle class could include farmers with small amounts of land, merchants with a single storefront, or businessmen who ran several enterprises and employed a fair number of people. However, this project is primarily concerned with the portion of the population that participated in conspicuous consumption and may have been concerned with the rising fashions of aristocratic society. Therefore I will use terms like "middling class" or "middle sort" to refer to the group of people that was attempting to raise its social standing to something similar to that of the noble class.

For the upwardly mobile classes, those who were finding more economic success and therefore involved more and more in conspicuous consumption, standards were

[13] Davidson, ed. *The Oxford Companion to Food*, 713.

changing. Paul Langford writes extensively on this subject and remarks that "the numbers who described themselves as 'Mr', 'Mrs', and 'Esquire'" was on the rise in the eighteenth century and "in an urban context it was increasingly worthless as an indication of rank." According to Langford, social standing was determined by several factors that were occasionally easy to define, such as property and profession or employment, and others that were more ambiguous, such as "connections, politeness, and breeding."[14]

Because they didn't have a birthright that guaranteed them a high place along the social ladder, the middling classes used the above factors to advance slowly. They often wanted to live in a manner closer to that of the gentry families which included less day-to-day involvement in household manners. For men this meant being able to delegate his business matters to his employees and spend more time hunting in the country. For women, this meant a new standard of femininity which took the lady of the house away from the stove and into the doorway of the kitchen where she could assign household tasks to employees. Being a "lady" in the eighteenth century was "incompatible with taking an active part in food preparation."[15] Successful cookbook authors in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries were directing their books to an audience of housewives, housekeepers, and "polite" ladies who were likely to present the books to their employees for instructional purposes. E. Taylor's book *The Lady's, Housewife's, and Cookmaid's Assistant* was "designed to fit out an Entertainment in an Elegant

[14] Paul Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People: England 1727-1783,* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), 62-65.
[15] Gilly Lehmann, *The British Housewife: Cookery Books, Cooking and Society in Eighteenth-Century Britain*, (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1999), 70.

Manner, and at a Small Expence," as explained on the title page. The emphasis of the instruction was on entertainment, elegance, and frugality, as her audience could be either women running their own households or women who had employees but were still concerned about spending too much money. Female-authored texts very rarely wrote for only one group of people and their introductions most often referred to all classes of women who could possibly get a hold of the book. Taylor also claims in the preface to be writing in a way that servants could understand in order to teach them how to please their master or mistress, but still not trying to direct "any lady in the economy of her family," highlighting an audience of both ladies and servants.[16] Many books published during this time had very similar introductions, writing in a clear and direct way for those at a low literacy rate to understand, yet emphasizing their experience in running a sophisticated and "elegant" household. Charlotte Mason's introduction in her 1773 cookbook tells readers that she is writing for "ladies in general" but her instructions are meant to be for women who have not had the opportunity to learn the correct way to prepare and serve food.[17] Without more specifics, these women could include young wives who had no experience directing employees or new domestic servants who did not had any practice in setting a table or working in a kitchen. Maria Rundell in 1816 included instructions both for ladies concerned about the "comfort of her husband" and cooks who must pay "attention to [the tastes] of her employers."[18] Male-authored texts,

[16] E. Taylor, *The Lady's, Housewife's, and Cookmaid's Assistant: or, the Art of Cookery Explained and Adapted to the meanest Capacity* (Berwick upon Tweed, 1769), i-ii.
[17] Charlotte Mason, *The Lady's Assistant for Regulating and Supplying Her Table, Being a Complete System of Cookery* (Dublin, 1777), iii.
[18] Maria Rundell, *A New System of Domestic Cookery; Formed upon Principles of Economy* (London, 1816), v; xx.

on the other hand, rarely had such a complex audience. Most of the introductions to these texts written by men mention only the role of the housekeeper or cook. William Kitchiner's introduction in 1817 tells readers that he had "written for those who make nourishment the chief end of eating," mainly the cooks who actually prepared the food rather than ladies who directed the preparation.[19]

The "Professional" History of Cuisine and Cookbooks

The profession of cooking in Europe had historically been a man's job. Professionally trained cooks working in royal or aristocratic households learned the art of French cuisine, encompassing extravagant techniques and recipes. Before about 1650 published cookery books were most often an exchange of ideas between these professionals, rather than a book of instructions for amateurs. The books contained new recipes of the author's making as well as learned recipes. This was evident in the fact that early published cookbooks took for granted the fact that their readers had the most basic skills necessary to cook a meal or run a kitchen. Cookbooks written by women at this time were most often unpublished manuscripts. These books were compilations of popular recipes and sometimes included new inventions. These women were not producing the manuscripts for a commercial purpose, however. Most often they were private "receipt-books," kept as a personal keepsake or passed between family and friends. Throughout the seventeenth century, as men dominated the commercial cookbook industry, the writers were actively producing new recipes and techniques and English writers were emulating the propensity of French chefs to view cooking as both

[19] William Kitchiner, *Apicus Redivivus; or, The Cook's Oracle* (London, 1817), sig. [A4v.]

an art and a science. English authors who were influenced by French professional cooks wrote books that clearly show Enlightenment influence. Reason and logic affected the structure of published cookbooks and the format became more consistent from author to author. Recipes were grouped into categories, with a Table of Contents to guide readers, and indexes were provided to assist in making a more efficient search for a single recipe.[20]

In France, training within the world of professional cuisine was undertaken by a number of different food guilds present since the Middle Ages. Paris hosted the best guilds in France and was widely known as France's culinary center as it had access to the best quality and quantity of different ingredients as well as the population needed to encourage innovation. Guild statutes limited the number of masterships available by setting extremely high standards for attaining the position of a master. Cooks were allowed only one apprentice at a time, limiting the number of people allowed to train in the art of cuisine and making the training much more valuable. Although the regulations were limiting in this way, they did allow for lateral movement between guilds. An apprentice could gain training in several different guilds, such as the cook-caterers or the distillers, before settling on a single guild and becoming a master himself. Overall, the food guilds in Paris were seen in France as producing the highest quality chefs. These men were very often summoned to Versailles to stand in for court chefs and put on feasts for the court.[21]

---

[20] Willan, *The Cookbook Library*, 195.
[21] Wheaton, *Savoring the Past,* 72-73.

Louis XIV's Edict of Fontainbleau, which dictated the expulsion of Protestants from France, resulted in a mass exodus of skilled craftsmen from France, including a large number of cooks who had been professionally trained in the food-guilds of Paris. Although this was not the beginning of the export of French cuisine to other places in Europe, it certainly bolstered the number of professionals who sought work in households outside of France and taught new cooks in places like England. The experience these professionals gained from the food guilds of Paris proved extremely useful as they were able to find new apprentices in places like England, teaching these new cooks more than just one branch of cookery. The food and drink guilds in Britain were similar to those of France, limiting membership and generally excluding women. French masters could have found opportunities within the British guilds to teach new apprentices. Marketing themselves as "artists" and promoting French cuisine as an "art of cookery" was also useful in finding employment in noble households. William Verral's cookbook *A Complete System of Cookery* published in 1759 makes reference to his training under a "Mons. de St. Clouet" who served as a "Cook to his Grace the Duke of Newcastle," a prime example of the use of foreign chefs in English households to promote exoticism and power.[22]

The "Grand Tour" also contributed to the dissemination of French cuisine, perhaps more significantly than political edicts like Louis XIV's. British travelers to France were incredibly common, especially during the eighteenth century even though Anglo-French political tension was at its height. British tourists travelled all over Europe

[22] William Verral, *A Complete System of Cookery* (London, 1759), i.

for many different reasons and the "Grand Tour," a trip undertaken by young men before settling down in their chosen profession, was just one of these reasons. The amount of information brought back to Britain by these travelers contributed to significant changes in the social world of Britons. Jeremy Black's work on the Grand Tour seems to suggest that British responses to all things foreign contributed to a more heightened sense of xenophobia during the nineteenth century. Published cookbooks tell us that Britons were constantly trying new foods from all across the world, evidence of the increasingly international culture of Great Britain. Tourism, especially all the travels to France, enhanced the difficulties that people had in reconciling their desire to be socially sophisticated through the use and perpetuation of exotic articles, and their need to express political loyalty to Britain and antipathy to France.[23] Suggestions by authors like Alexander Hunter and William Verral to replace foreign goods with local ones reflect this paradox.[24]

Cooking as an art was a notion that first became noticeable in England during the seventeenth century and cookbooks published there reflect this idea that was propagated by French masters.[25] The use of new ingredients, the development of new technologies associated with cuisine, and experimentation with cooking techniques resulted in the creation of new recipes attributed to the various chefs that discovered them. However,

---

[23] For more information about Black's thoughts on the affect the Grand Tour and European tourism had on British culture, refer to *The British and the Grand Tour* (Dover: Croom Helm, 1985).; See also: Chapter 7, "The Fortunate Isle," in Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People*, 289 for a discussion of British xenophobia.

[24] Both Hunter and Verral recommend replacing Parmesan cheese with Cheshire cheese in several of their recipes. A more complete discussion of this is found in Chapter 3, in the section titled "Anglicizing Recipes."

[25] Davidson, *Oxford Companion to Food*, 212.

even though "experimentation" is generally associated with science, professional chefs phrased their discoveries in terms of art by placing the emphasis on the genteel and technical skills required for creating extravagant and gourmet dishes. This idea of cooking also came about as cooking technologies such as pans made of new materials or more efficient heating methods made cooking healthier in general and there was less emphasis on meals having to be specifically prepared in a way that would prevent its consumers from becoming sick. Even as late as 1789 authors were still reminding their readers to use the proper cookware, like John Farley who discussed "the sad consequence of not keeping their Coppers and Saucepans properly tinned."[26] As *nouvelle cuisine* was perfected in France and exported throughout Europe, professional cooks marketing themselves as "artists" were able to find employment in many elite households in Britain. The culinary artistry trend was present in England as well as France, and English cookbook authors very often used the phrase "the art of cookery," or some variation, in their titles and introductions. When the *nouvelle cuisine* trend hit the middling classes in the middle of the eighteenth century, the artistry of food was very appealing as a way to project sophistication and wealth.

In the world of published texts, cookery books comprise their own category, in more ways than just being a genre apart. A reader must also take into consideration the history of the content and the publishing process. Both of these are different from a novel or non-fiction book. The content is generally not the author's original work, making it difficult to assign creative ownership to anyone. The "author" printed on the

[26] John Farley, *The London Art of Cookery, and Housekeeper's Complete Assistant* (Dublin, 1783), iv.

title page is more often than not simply the compiler or collector of the recipes in the book. Because of the difficulty of tracing the origin of the recipes located inside the book, finding the actual "author" of each individual recipe is impossible. That being said, a compiler may occasionally attribute a specific recipe to someone who may be the author or the patron of the compiler who took a particular liking to the specified dish. William Verral gained his cooking experience under the tutelage of a "Mons. de St. Clouet," as the title page of his *Complete System of Cookery* tells us. As such, he frequently included recipes that were attributed to St. Clouet such as "Hind chine of mutton after the fashion of Mr. Clouet" or "Salmon in slices Mr. Clouet's fashion."[27] Furthermore, the "author" may not actually be a real person, but instead a persona created by a publisher or compiler to make the cookery book more marketable. For example, a matronly woman named Betty Crocker is more trustworthy when it comes to recipes than a thin mustachioed publisher. In Martha Bradley's cookbook *The British Housewife* published in 1760, the pronoun "we" is used instead of the pronoun "I" in the directions and explanations accompanying the recipes. For example, in the introduction to Chapter XXII "Of placing the Dishes," it reads "We acknowledge that we have learned a great deal of the Art of Cookery from [the French]…"[28] Although there are certainly literary techniques that may support the use of "we" even if there is only a single author, the use of the word also suggests that there were several people involved in the writing of this cookbook, including publishers and printers. These facts are important to understand, especially when approaching cookery books published between

[27] Verral, *A Complete System of Cookery*, 51; 74.
[28] Bradley, *The British Housewife*, 69.

1750 and 1850 because it becomes especially difficult to track ownership and original authorship of recipes from this period when so much information has been lost over time.

For this reason it is necessary to separate commercially published cookbooks into two categories, defined here as "female-authored" and "male-authored." Although the structure and overall content of the two groups are similar, there are differences when looking at the language of introductions, recipe titles, and recipe instruction. The recipes included may be exactly the same from book to book but the presentation differs between the texts that were female-authored and those that were male-authored. These differences are based on many things including gender stereotypes of the period, training, and experience and these will be discussed later in this chapter.

The first thing that needs to be explained is the existence of food- and gender-based binaries within the world of published cookbooks. Discussing the images of male and female authors of these cookbooks necessitates a binary vocabulary of cuisine, with gendered definitions of culinary professionalism including the female "cook" versus the male "chef." These terms are not mutually exclusive, however. A "chef" is never a woman but a "cook" could be either a man or a woman. This concept gets a little too close to discussing the merits of the inherent gender inequality existent in this system, however, and is not necessarily the point of this topic. That these inequalities exist is important to understand but this analysis does not attempt to evaluate whether or not the inequalities are morally correct. The gendered vocabulary within the world of cuisine and published cookbooks is rooted in traditional, Western, gender definitions of the early

modern world which includes the belief that women cannot be defined as professionals since their sphere is the private home. Women participated in the sphere of cuisine in a more traditional feminine role, the role of the mother, wife, housekeeper, etc. The other side of this binary is that men dominate the professional, acting within the public sphere of cooking, such as training institutions and food-guilds, and acting in the professional realm as a hired chef. There is an overlap in the world of food when thinking about the origins of cuisine itself. The stereotype of the kitchen as a woman's domain, and a woman's "place," seems to be in discord with the early modern idea that the professionalization of cuisine was a man's "place." This brings into light the conflict between "place" and "space." The world of food includes the very real "space" of the kitchen and the less tangible "place" of the professional practice of cooking. The kitchen, therefore, is historically a women's "space" but the development of formal cuisines is a man's "place." As female authors become more prominent during the eighteenth century, this changed considerably. By the time that Alexander Hunter and William Kitchiner published their cookbooks, in the first two decades of the nineteenth century, male-authored texts were reverting back to an emphasis on the medical properties of cookery. Hunter refers to himself as a "medical man" and his commentary on the various recipes focus on what is best for the "British constitution."[29] Kitchiner's *The Cook's Oracle* is a physician's treatise on anything a cook, housekeeper, or servant could possibly need to refer to. Entries are listed alphabetically and recipes are interspersed with entries on illnesses and treatments, as well as commentary on how

[29] Alexander Hunter, *Culina Famulatrix Medicina; or Receipts in Modern Cookery* (York, 1806), 9; 46.

each recipe is "nourishing without being inflammatory, and savoury without being surfeiting."[30] These two books are representative of the fact that women successfully made the world of artistic cuisine their "space" as well as their "place," pushing men out and into a "space" dominated by medicine rather than cookery.

"Let us introduce ourselves…"

Starting around the middle of the seventeenth century, as female-authored texts became more common, published cookbooks began with an introduction or preface written by the author for their readers. In some cases, such as Sarah Harrison's *The House-keeper's Pocket Book*, the author felt it necessary to include both an introduction and preface, a practice not uncommon in other genres but very rare in the world of cookbooks.[31] While introductions were not a new phenomenon, in the world of published texts they had historically been written to a patron or friend rather than the readers. In cookery books, however, the letter to the reader became standard practice both describing the background and experience of the author as well as providing an overview of the contents of the book itself. In these introductions we discover the identity of the author and how it affected the content of the book. As stated before, cookery books were not original pieces of work by the author but were instead compilations and collections of recipes. Oftentimes they were collections of a lifetime of experience in the culinary world, but this experience varied based on whether the book was compiled by a male or female.

[30] Kitchiner, *Apicius Redivivus*, 3.
[31] Sarah Harrison, *The House-keeper's Pocket Book and Compleat Family Cook* (London, 1733).

As the middling sort began to have more disposable income, but could not necessarily afford French cooks or foreign servants, they began to hire domestic household staff.[32] Although these families were not able to get genuine *nouvelle cuisine* from a French chef, cookbooks allowed them to experience the fashion and tastes of a wealthier class. The rise in households hiring domestic staff also contributed to the ability of young women in Great Britain to find employment.[33] This trend led to two things: first was a generation of female authors who began to dominate the cookbook industry around the 1730s basing the books on their experience as cooks or housekeepers in English households. Martha Bradley tells us that her book is "the result of upwards of Thirty Years Experience…which is deduc'd from Practice," Mary Johnson says that she was "for many Years a Superintendent of a Lady of Quality's Family," and Mary Cole discusses how her "original receipts" are "the result of many years experience and assiduity in the profession."[34] These examples are categorically different from Robert May's experience who book *The Accomplisht Cook*, published in 1665, wrote on his title page that his receipts were "approved by the fifty five years experience and industry of Robert May, in his attendance on several persons of great honor."[35] As cookbook authorship shifted to being dominated by women, an author with experience as an "English housekeeper" was the most marketable attribute of cookbooks. The women

[32] Coloquon, *Taste,* 198.
[33] Kirsten Olsen, *Daily Life in 18th Century England* (Westport, Greenwood Press, 1999), 71.; See also Mark Girouard, *Life in the English Country House: A Social and Architectural History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978), 142, to learn how female domestic servants became more commonplace than male household servants starting in the early seventeenth century.
[34] Bradley, *The British Housewife,* 1.; Mary Johnson, *The Young Woman's Companion* (London, 1753), 1.; Mary Cole, *The Lady's Complete Guide* (London, 1788), 3.
[35] May, *The Accomplisht Cook*, sig. [A3v].

who were writing the cookbooks nearly always included in their introduction their experience as a housekeeper to support the efficiency, frugality, and tradition associated with the recipes that they chose to include. Neither Cole nor Johnson list a specific number of years, yet presumably they don't need to since their profession is listed as well; Cole lists herself as a "cook" and Johnson as a "Superintendent." Bradley, on the other hand, simply lists "Thirty Years Experience" without the addition of a profession. We can assume, since her book's title begins with the term "housewife" rather than housekeeper or cook, her experience relevant to the writing of this book was as a housewife. Female authors focus on the experience as a whole rather than the prestige of their previous employers. Eliza Smith references her thirty years of experience working for "fashionable and noble Families," noting that not every family she worked for was technically "noble" but still had enough money to hire her.[36] Regardless of the specific background, all three authors apparently felt it necessary to list the specific experience from which their knowledge came, assuring the reader that the information they presented was reliable.

Although the early books written by men also relied on their experience, a different class of experience was emphasized in the male-authored texts. These books were more likely to boast of employment that highlighted a more professional capacity and higher standard of training. This training was often reflected through employment in specifically noble households or in the royal court. May, for example, dedicates his cookbook to "The Right Honourable my Lord Mountague, my Lord Lumley and my

[36] E. Smith, *The Compleat Housewife: or Accomplish'd Gentlewoman's Companion* (London, 1742), sig. [A4r].

Lord Dormer, and to the Right Worshipful Sir Kenelme Digby."[37] B. Clermont, in *The Professed Cook*, described himself as "many years clerk of the kitchen in some of the first families of this kingdom, and lately to the Right Hon. The Earl of Abingdon."[38] A final example is John Perkins in *Every Woman Her Own Housekeeper* who was "many years Cook in the families of Earl Goner and Lord Melbourn."[39] The specific experience necessary to sell a cookbook could have also been from employment in a public capacity, such as a tavern or inn. John Collingwood and John Woollams, in their book *The Universal Cook*, had been the "principal cooks at the Crown and Anchor Tavern" as well as the "London Tavern."[40] The term "principal cook" was reserved for men who had trained professional under a culinary master and is only found in male-authored cookbooks.[41]

The rise in the need for domestic servants also led to another trend: the need for cookbooks that were more instructional and carefully written for amateurs, with the assumption that the readers knew nothing of cooking or running a household. The first authors who commercially published their cookbooks directed their books to culinary professionals, like Robert May in 1665 who specifically addresses his introduction to "the Master Cooks, and to such young Practitioners of the Art of Cookery, to whom this Book may be useful." Later authors would instead write for all employees involved in the culinary experience, from professed cooks to simple servants, such as Hannah Glasse

[37] May, *The Accomplisht Cook,* sig [A3r].
[38] B. Clermont, *The Professed Cook, or the Modern Art of Cookery, Pastry, and Confectionary* (London, 1776), i.
[39] John Perkins, *Every Woman Her Own Housekeeper; or The Ladies' Library* (London, 1796), i.
[40] Francis Collingwood and John Woollams, *The Universal Cook, and City and Country Housekeeper* (London, 1792), i.
[41] Davidson, *The Oxford Companion to Food*, 158.

in *The Art of Cookery,* published first in 1747, who wrote that her "intention is to instruct the lower Sort" and she writes from her "experience [of] the generality of servants."[42] The need to instruct amateurs was evidenced by the fact that published cookbooks began to have a more consistent instructional structure and format, as well as images that assisted in the basic tasks of cooking. In 1760 Martha Bradley's book *The British Housewife* included woodcuts that showed how to truss hares, woodcocks, pigeons, rabbits, pheasants, and chickens for roasting and boiling. Each animal had at least one image on the page to indicate how it was to be laid out before roasting or boiling.[43] Mrs. Frazer's cookbook in 1791 included an almost identical woodcut at the beginning of her cookbook. The layout of the image is the same but the actual examples of trussed animals are in far greater detail than those in Bradley's.[44] For those authors who included bills of fare in their cookbooks, which were very common, the section listed the appropriate dishes for each course for several different types of dinner. The bills of fare were usually separated out by month and included instructions on how to serve various amounts of people. Each author who provided this section also provided images of how to set the courses out on the table, with meat dishes at the head and foot of the table and the accompanying side dishes in the middle. The frontispiece to another cookbook, *The Housekeeper's Instructor* by William Henderson, shows a cookbook being used as an instructional tool. The picture is of a kitchen scene with several different employees set to various tasks by the mistress of the house directing in the

[42] Robert May, *The Accomplisht Cook, or the Art and Mystery of Cookery* (London: R. Wood, 1665), sig. [A4r].; Hannah Glasse, *The Art of Cookery,* i.
[43] Bradley, *The British Housewife*, 217.
[44] Mrs. Frazer, *The Practice of Cookery, Pastry, Pickling, Preserving, &c* (Edinburgh, 1791), i.

middle of the room. The caption at the bottom reads, "A Lady presenting her servant with the Universal Family Cook who diffident of her own knowledge has recourse to that Work for Information. On the right hand a Person Instructing a Young Man in the Art of Carving by referring to a print on that subject…"[45]

Hannah Glasse's *The Art of Cookery* in 1747 started with an introduction that defined her audience and explained the structure of the cookbook, a practice that became commonplace during the eighteenth century. Most books included a table of contents to make it more efficient to find a single recipe in books that were often over 300 pages long. The recipes were also written with step-by-step instructions and generally began with details on how to choose ingredients or where to purchase them. The sections on meat, for example, almost always began with basic instructions on roasting and broiling, in case the reader was completely new to the kitchen. This structure was evidence of the phenomenon of either complete amateurs or novices finding employment in households where they were expected to learn fast while still conveying elegance and taste. Middle class women who were trying to emulate their social superiors would not necessarily be able to train their employees in these matters so purchasing a book like *The Lady's Complete Guide* or *The House-Keeper's Pocket Book* for their employees would have been well worth the expense.[46]

---

[45] William Augustus Henderson, *The Housekeeper's Instructor; or, Universal Family Cook* (London, 1790), i.

[46] Prices for cookbooks varied based on the length of the book but for the most part, they sold for around 2s. 6d. (Harrison, *The House-keeper's Pocket Book* in 1733; Glasse, *The Art of Cookery* in 1747; Robert Abbot, *The Housekeeper's Valuable Present; or a Lady's Closet Companion* in 1790; Eliza Melroe, *A Economic and New Method of Cookery* in 1798). John Selwyn sold *The Servant's Companion* in 1846 for one shilling and Rundell's *A New System of Domestic Cookery* in 1816 was seven shillings and six pence. These two were the outliers in the sample used for this project.

As travel within Great Britain became cheaper and more efficient, it was easier for young women to travel to urban areas and find employment away from their birthplace. Moving away from their friends and family required these young women to rely on published cookbooks, etiquette books, and household books to know how to act in a way relevant to their station, as described above. By the 1740s, almost forty per cent of women in England could read, and the increasing dependence on printed books to learn how to act in polite society was connected to the growing literacy of England.[47] Also, as these women later began to write their own cookbooks, they brought with them regional influences from all over Great Britain. This made cookbooks a way to promote both national and regional identity. Ultimately, the writing and reading of cookbooks provided a way for women, who could not engage in traditional political activity, to participate in conversations about British identity. As middling class families within Great Britain began to lean more heavily on domestic household staff, because of their inability to afford foreigners, housekeepers and servants lent their "British" experience to the identity of the household. "British" households came to be preferred by the rising middling sort in Britain, promoting a more domestic cookery rather than the traditional French cuisine employed in court cookery.

Without consumption statistics about the cookbooks we have no way of knowing whether a male-authored or female-authored book sold the most copies. However, we can infer certain things from the number of editions certain books went through. (See Appendix A for a list of all books included in this study and the years each edition was

[47] Colquhoun, *Taste,* 199.

published.) We can also compare the marketing tactics used by authors and publishers and attempt to determine which were most successful by how often they occurred in our cookbook sample. According to the information available, female-authored texts went through an average of six editions while male-authored texts only went through an average of three. Some books written by female authors, such as those by Eliza Smith and Hannah Glasse had at least twenty editions and some only had one edition, like those written by Martha Bradley and Mary Cole. At the same time, John Farley's cookbook had twelve editions, the most of the male-authored texts. The average number of editions, however, does suggest that female-authored texts were often more successful in employing marketing strategies than the male-authored ones were.

Female-authored vs. Male-authored Texts

Because the professional world of cooking was regulated by men, women were rarely allowed to train under great chefs. Instead, their experience in the kitchen was the result of growing up watching their mothers, grandmothers, aunts, etc. As one author wrote, "There is no opportunity of attaining a knowledge of family management at school," and these skills were only learned if a parent was willing to teach and show their children how it was done. [48] "Family management" could have referred to anything from managing the budget, the kitchen, or the children. Recipes were handed down to daughters and nieces and personal "receipt-books" often contained recipes written in many different hands. The changing nature of published cookbooks themselves was a testament to this as the recipes were considered to be adaptable and authors expected

[48] Rundell, *A New System of Domestic Cookery*, ii.

their readers to modify them if need be. *The Lady's, Housewife's and Cookmaid's Assistant* tells us that "every lady has her own particular fancy" and that there is not necessarily one single way of doing anything. Her recipe for "Salmagundi" uses "either a red herring, a pickled herring, or three or four anchovies, which you please," reminding the reader that their opinion, and the opinion of those they are serving, is the only thing that really matters when it comes to how a dish tastes. Along the same lines, Hannah Glasse's recipe for "Salamongundy" says that "you may always make [it] of such things as you have, according to your Fancy."[49]

The stated authors of the female-authored texts were displayed in several different ways. Early publications generally used generic titles as "By a Lady" or "Mrs. Frazer" or they chose not to reveal their gender at all, choosing only a first initial rather than a full first name.[50] Only in the later publications did women begin listing their full names. This was mostly likely both a marketing ploy as well as an expression of hesitance by the women themselves to promote their status as a female author. In an age where the middling class was working to gain more social credibility from the aristocracy, a woman publishing a cookbook for the sole purpose of making money was not the ideal situation for a woman who was attempting to work her way up the social ladder. Many of the authors based their culinary credibility on their experience running a household with the professed goal of sharing their experience for the good of others, not necessarily to make money.

---

[49] Taylor, *Lady's, Housewife's and Cookmaid's Assistant,* ii and 54.; Glasse, *The Art of Cookery*, 60.
[50] Glasse, *The Art of Cookery*.; Frazer. *The Practice of Cookery*; Taylor, *Lady's, Housewife's, and Cookmaid's Assistant*.

An older married woman giving instruction, rather than a young single one, also gave the book more credibility. The impression was that single women didn't run households. If they were employed as anything, it would be a domestic servant not in charge of the household. On the other hand, a middle-aged married woman could have the necessary experience from one of two places: either she had spent her life working in another Lady's household as a housekeeper, running the kitchen and overseeing the servants, or she had spent her life running her own household as a housewife. Either way, her age and status as a married woman meant that she had the experience necessary to write a good cook book. A housewife who was looking to purchase one of these books would presumably be more comfortable taking directions from Mrs. Frazer rather than from a young, unmarried woman with no management experience.

Hannah Glasse's *The Art of Cookery Made Plain and Easy* was first published in 1747 and the first edition used the term "By a Lady" instead of listing an author's name. While her later editions alternated between listing Glasse's full name and using the simple "Lady" identifier, the fact remains that the publishers made use of a very simple marketing tool. As mentioned before, by this time in London the word "Lady" did not necessarily mean a woman married to a man with an official rank. Rather, it referred to a woman of sophistication and a certain social standing that many middle class families aspired to. Glasse was one of the first of the female cookbook authors who wrote not for a "nobleman's kitchen, but for ladies in the upper middle ranks of society in charge of their own domestic establishments."[51] They were not doing the cooking themselves but

[51] Mennell, *All Manners of Food,* 95.; Lehman, *The British Housewife,* 110-111

were instead directing their kitchen staff in menu decisions or giving instructions for shopping trips. A frontispiece that was included in a later edition of Glasse's cookbook portrayed just that, the mistress of the house directing her cook in manners of the kitchen. The image shows a very well-dressed woman seated a table with an open cookbook next to her. She is giving hand-written instructions to a more modestly dressed woman, presumably the cook or one of the kitchen staff. The caption to the image is a short poem that reads, "The Fair, who's Wise and oft consults our Book, and thence directions gives her Prudent Cook, With chociest viands, has her Table Crown'd, and Health, with Frugal Ellegance is found."[52] William Henderson's frontispiece also included the caption, "A Lady presenting her servant with the Universal Family Cook who diffident of her own knowledge has recourse to that Work for Information."[53] In London in the second half of the eighteenth century, "it was quite a fad for ladies to give books as gifts to their maids and servants" as the books provided the knowledge necessary to learn quickly how to work in a sophisticated and elegant household.[54]

Cookbooks like Glasse's would have been ideal for a servant since it was written for "every Servant who can but read," but not in "the high, polite Stile" that a gentlewoman would expect to be reading. The structure of *The Art of Cookery* included instructions on basic cooking methods and a clear organization of recipe by type. Furthermore, the clear distinction of her audience in the introduction was imitated by authoresses who published after the first edition of Glasse's cookbook. She identified her

[52] Hannah Glasse, *The Art of Cookery Made Plain and Easy* (London, 1775), i.
[53] Henderson, *The Universal Family Cook*, i.
[54] Willan, *The Cookbook Library*, 212.

readers as members of her own sex, "[begging] the Favour of every Lady to read [her] book." Glasse was very upfront about her negative opinion of the French, calling out French chefs as taking advantage of Englishmen. She writes that "so much is the blind folly of this Age, that they would rather be impos'd on by a French Booby, than give Encouragement to a good English Cook!"[55]

Not every female-authored cookbook was as overt about their opinions of the French. Most used subtle references to the expense or unhealthy nature of French cuisine. Elizabeth Raffald, in *The Experienced English Housekeeper*, seems to have taken her lead from Glasse when it comes to the introduction. She is careful to say that the recipes are not written in "high Stile, but wrote in my own plain language" so that the book is accessible to anyone of any literacy level or social standing. She is less overt about her feelings regarding the French, however, but she too pairs French recipes with expense. In her introduction she writes that "though I have given some of my dishes French Names…they will not be found very Expensive" as she modified them to be more suitable to an English constitution and pocketbook.[56]

Mary Johnson's *The Young Woman's Companion* is specifically for servants, not aiming to be for women of all classes. She describes her audience as being "that class of People, for whose Service [the book] is more immediately intended, Servants throughout his Majesty's Dominions."[57] Although the book includes far more than just recipes, and the first few chapters are essays on the proper conduct and education for a young lady,

[55] Hannah Glasse, *The Art of Cookery Made Plain and Easy* (London, 1747), i-ii.
[56] Elizabeth Raffald. *The Experienced English Housekeeper, for the Use and Ease of Ladies, House-keepers, Cooks, &c.* (London, 1769), i-ii.
[57] Johnson, *The Young Woman's Companion*, i.

the chapter on cookery includes the subtitle "Instructions for Dressing all Sorts of Common Provisions, in the most approv'd Manner."[58] There are only two recipes with overtly French titles, "To make French-biscuits" and "To make French Flummery." Both recipes are listed after "common" recipes for biscuits and flummery and utilize more ingredients and complex preparations than the common ones do. Her obvious emphasis is providing the simplest recipes necessary for a young woman to be successful in a servant's position.

Martha Bradley, in *The British Housewife,* includes a few French recipes but never says that their way of cooking is better or their dishes superior to English ones. She does, however, concede that the French know best when it comes to setting the table. Although she never uses the specific term *service à la Française,* Bradley does write that when it comes to placing the dishing and doing the honors of a table, "we have learned many little arts of the French, and 'tis pity we do not a little more carefully follow them in this."[59] Even with this admission that the French service involves little ceremony while still maintaining good manners, she also says that "the good old English Custom, though more ceremonious, was more obliging."[60] Fashion dictated that she must include information on how the French set a table and serve a meal but her own opinion on her heritage and culture compelled her to say that she still prefers "good English custom."

[58] Ibid., 114.
[59] Bradley, *The British Housewife*, 69.
[60] Ibid., 73.

On the other side of things, we have male-authored texts whose authors chose to rely on their professional training and experience in noble households as proof of the experience and knowledge necessary to instruct amateurs. William Verral's *A Complete System of Cookery* (1759) stated quite clearly on his title page that he was a student of "Mr. de St. Clouet," and that his recipes contained a hint of the "true character of Mons. de St. Clouet."[61] Many of the recipes include notes about what Mr. Clouet preferred in terms of technique or serving style, such as "Hind chine of mutton after the fashion of Mr. Clouet" and all of the recipes are listed with a French title first followed by an English title. The recipe instructions include French phrases which are italicized, but never translated, suggesting not only his familiarity with the French language but his preference and appreciation for it. Although Verral doesn't hide his clear love of French food and his French patron the appreciation of certain "British" qualities also appear at various points throughout the text. For example, in his recipe "Des pigeonneaux a la duxelle" he adds a note that instructs his readers in a second way to prepare the dish but adds that it "is very troublesome and expensive, and I think not better." Traditional British frugality wins out in this instance, rather than the French zeal for complicated recipes requiring too many expensive ingredients. Again, in the section on pastries, he writes that "As to pastry things I shall put but few, for I think the English in most of them excel" admitting that there are some things in the world of food in which the British already had superiority.[62]

[61] Verral, *A Complete System of Cookery*, i. For the purposes of clarity, I list any recipes from Verral's book in English unless the French version is most appropriate. However, it is to be understood that even the recipes listed in English had a French equivalent that was listed first in Verral's cookbook.
[62] Ibid., 51; 138; 157.

B. Clermont, publishing *The Professed Cook* in 1769, was proud of his experience as a clerk to "some of the first families of this kingdom, and lately to the Right Hon. The Earl of Abingdon." His experience would be especially appealing to middle class households since he had firsthand knowledge of what went on in the kitchens of the noble families. His title page gives us his opinion of French cuisine as he stated that this book was a translation of a French cookbook called *Les Soupers de la Cour,* and that he wanted to provide French recipes so they became "familiar" to English households. For recipes that have French titles, he lists an English translation as well stating that it is useful to have an English translation since not everyone had an "opportunity of being acquainted with French cookery." He is very open about his desire for everyone to become familiar with French cuisine, probably stemming from his opinion that it is well worthwhile and that French food would not disappear from British society. He even stated his anticipation that recipe titles in French would "soon become familiar to every common Understanding, being mostly adopted in the English Language already."[63]

The fact that "professional" training in French cuisine dictated a person's opinion on the French as a whole seems to be even more obvious when considering male-authored texts who don't boast experience with French cuisine. Authors Farley, Abbot, and Collingwood/Woollams were all authors who didn't have a French training background apparent in their books. They all worked for culinary businesses in London. Farley, Collingwood and Woollams worked at taverns and Abbott worked under master

[63] Clermont, *The Professed Cook,* iii-v.

confectioners. Their books have a different feel from those based on experience working for a single family. Working in a job that dealt with the London population on a day to day basis contributed to a more patriotic attitude, especially since taverns were most frequently visited by members of London's merchant and tradesmen classes. London was the center of political, social, commercial, and intellectual life, and all these aspects intersected in the coffeehouses and pubs. Kirstin Olsen put it quite aptly when she wrote, "city taverns and coffeehouses were the resort of single men, merchants and professionals conducting business, club members who held their meetings, and literary types."[64] Taverns also catered to all classes of people serving anything from rough, home-brewed ale to the finest imported wines, and offering diners a choice between a common table or a rented dining room.[65]

John Farley's publication of *The London Art of Cookery* was based off his experience as the principal cook at the London Tavern, according to the title page. His preface ensures the reader that "nothing inelegant" was included and his goal was the make the book "worthy of the Patronage of the Public." His introduction is a brief history of the culinary arts, from the "early ages of the world" to his present day, inevitably stating that boiling and roasting began as the most basic modes of cooking and only "the introduction of trade and commerce into Europe, soon made us acquainted with the products of other countries."[66] Although the cookbook includes some typical French recipes, such as "French biscuits," "To make French bread," and "Beef à-la-

[64] OIsen, *Daily Life in 18th Century England*, 237.
[65] Coloquon, *Taste*, 100.
[66] Farley, *The London Art of Cookery*.

daube," the book consists more of recipes from various British counties. "English fig wine," "Yorkshire goose pie," "Devonshire squab pie," and "Norfolk Dumplings" are only a few examples of the countless nostalgic recipes included for the people of Great Britain to employ.

Collingwood and Woollams, who together produced *The Universal Cook* based on their experience at the London Tavern and the Crown and Anchor Tavern in the Strand, acknowledged that food was "ever subject to the Variations of Taste and Fashion."[67] As such, their cookbook is filled with French recipes but their introduction begs the reader to pay close attention to the modified recipes where the authors removed excess ingredients. Their emphasis was on food that is simple and less expensive is shown through the organization of the recipes, where a recipe made "the French way" is listed after the same recipe made in a more traditional British method and generally less complicated.[68]

There are exceptions to every rule, however, and some male authors who worked in noble households and had "professional" training don't have a healthy appreciation for the French. As the next chapter shows, some authors like John Thacker had opinions similar to Glasse's with a preface full of comments about the unhealthy and expensive nature of French recipes. Thacker's book was published in 1758 as increased tensions between the British and the French led to the Seven Years War, a war that was truly global in nature. Experience and professional background were not the only factors that

[67] Collingwood and Woollams, *The Universal Cook,* ii.
[68] i.e. "Scotch Collops white," "Scotch Collops brown," and "Scotch Collops the French Way." Collingwood and Woollams, *The Universal Cook*, 46-48.

contributed to a person's view of the French or their development of national identity. Political events also had an impact on people's views, especially when warfare was a particularly good time for the British government to produce propaganda that made the French the "other," further bolstering a "British" identity.

CHAPTER III

BRITISH OR JUST ANTI-FRENCH?

CREATING A NATIONAL IDENTITY

French cuisine never disappeared from British cookbooks even when political propaganda used food as an example of the inferiority of the French, lauding traditional hearty, British, meals. There was, however, a shift in how French recipes were represented by authors as Anglo-French political tension heated up in the latter part of the eighteenth century and the early nineteenth century. As this chapter will show, criticism of French cuisine increased as the inclusion of French recipes took a significant downturn in published cookbooks. Through an analysis of the language of the introductions and commentary included with recipes we see an equation of French food with expense and extravagance, qualities opposed to traditional British values of frugality and economy. There is also a decrease of recipes with overtly French names and a modification of French techniques, making certain recipes more anglicized even while keeping a title with a French name. We've already seen how professional training could affect an author's representation of French cuisine in the previous chapter. This chapter will show how the paradox between loyalty to fashion and loyalty to the nation was expressed in published cookbooks. The middling classes were forced to confront both their desire to make fashionable displays of wealth and sophistication, and their economic obligation toward British patriotism, a conundrum that can be seen through food.

The middling classes of Great Britain had a complex relationship with the government. Up until the Seven Years War, the British and French empires on a parallel path to expand both the political reach of their respective governments as well the economic exploits of the nation. Great Britain's economy was based on a large domestic market with the British Isles as well as markets in other parts of the empire, a fragile balance that was attended to by the merchants of the middling class. Although their livelihood may not have directly depended on imperial markets, the success of the Empire as a whole ensured a prosperous Britain, bolstering the domestic market. The middling sort counted on Britain's continued supremacy over France as that primacy was reflected in the propagation of British goods. Their economic success was dependent on the ability to buy and sell products all over the Empire, including within the British Isles, and a larger empire meant more markets, with more markets equaling more money. In this way, support of the activities of the British government was a savvy business strategy for the middling classes. Outside of the political sphere these same people were celebrating their wealth on a social scale, which often included copying the manners and actions of Britain's landed class. An adoption of *nouvelle cuisine* and a celebration of foreignness when it came to food and manners was a way to exude a measure of sophistication equal to the middling sort's growing wealth. Taking advantage of this trend amongst the middle class, cookbook authors included some French recipes while still trying to appeal to a group of people who placed significance on British loyalty. As we will see below, the economic basis for loyalty generally superseded the

need to appear fashionable, especially during times of increased tension between Great Britain and France.

By the time that the Napoleon Wars were coming to an end, Whig leaders in Great Britain were considering a peace with Napoleon even while public opinion in Britain remained anti-French. The majority of the population was strictly opposed to peace with Napoleon and wanted British victory over the French to be absolute. As Rory Muir writes, "The public believed that victory was in sight and were in no mood to be cheated of its fruits." As Britain's leaders attempted to parlay with Napoleon, several issues were brought to light that could not be ignored.[1] Alluding to fears about the downfall of British culture, many Britons fought to profess British supremacy in all areas, including food. Roast beef and plum pudding were the great products of British culture and had played their part in contributing to a French defeat. Stuart Semmel has found that many people within Great Britain during and after the Napoleonic Wars, while still remaining fiercely loyal to their nation, found themselves doubting the resolve of the "Briton."[2] Fears about the loss of "English" identity in the eighteenth century were reflected in nineteenth century cartoons, newspapers, and pamphlets. The worry about the loss of identity began from the fear that the British had adopted too many aspects of the French culture, leading to the same cultural degeneration that people had traditionally mocked the French for. However the defeat of Napoleon did not necessarily mean that all Britons hated everything French. In fact, many Englishmen were initially

[1] Rory Muir, *Britain and the Defeat of Napoleon, 1807-1815* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), 318; 329.
[2] Stuart Semmel, *Napoleon and the British* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999), 40. For more information, see chapter 2, "National Character and National Anxiety" for his analysis of newspaper and loyalist tracts in the years leading up to, and during, the Napoleonic Wars.

pleased that a Bourbon king was to be placed back on the throne in France at it represented a restoration of traditional values in France. So how did all of this affect the views of French cuisine?

The Basis of Loyalty

Published cookbooks during the eighteenth century were clearly marketed toward an audience that was made up of the "middling sort" in Great Britain. The introductions were written for "ladies" and "gentlemen," terms that were increasingly associated with a specific type of attitude, wealth, and sophistication rather than titles or family histories. Successful merchants, lawyers, doctors, and other professionals within Great Britain were subtly re-defining the term "gentleman" to encompass more than just breeding. The right clothing, social activities, and manners were significant factors in identifying oneself as a gentleman. Along the same lines, wives of these men were identifying as "ladies," women of a certain level of wealth able to hire household staff and capable of directing them to create a sophisticated home for their families. Of course, the varied nature of the "middling sort" also included those families without enough money to employ many domestic servants and these women often participated in household matters in more than just a directorial capacity. Cookbook introductions recognized this variety and authors appealed to all levels of this middle class, touting the need for a book of instructions to create the most elegant and sophisticated atmosphere possible, on whatever budget available.

During a time where Britain and France were both contenders for "imperial and commercial primacy," fighting simultaneously for the position of world power, the

nature of this elegant household included characteristics that were traditionally "British," setting itself apart from the foreign and extravagant nature of the "French" household.[3] The middling class, those most intimately connected with the economic success of Great Britain, were using cookbooks as a tool to live up to the social ideal, while still supporting the supremacy of Great Britain over France. Their basis of loyalty was dependent on Britain as the global power.

In an age of globalization, trade routes connected everyone to a place they had never visited personally and European culture reflected more of an international influence than ever. The struggle for global primacy played out both on a European and an international stage as both nations raced toward creating an empire that would command the world's trade markets. The Seven Years War, the American War for Independence, and the Napoleonic Wars were three events that exemplify Anglo-French tension between 1750 and 1850. For people living in Great Britain, commercial competition with France provided the means for the development of a consciousness that was clearly "British" and the basis of loyalty within the upper classes of British society.[4] Class differences were very marked during the eighteenth century, identified primarily by wealth but which also included other indicators like profession and social activities. London was both the social and commercial center of Great Britain. Nearly all British peers owned or rented a residence there and most merchants and traders based their business out of the city.[5] The landed class and mercantile class didn't often rub shoulders

[3] Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707-1837*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), 56.
[4] Colley, *Britons,* 55-56.
[5] Ibid, 64.

within the city, but they were acutely aware of each other's existence. Trade was vital to Britain's survival and "the claim that trade was the muscle and the soul of Great Britain…was abundantly echoed in the poetry, drama, novels, newspapers, magazines" and private correspondence of the time. Although trade was considered extremely important to Britain's survival, the families who participated in it were still expected to know their place within society and not attempt to live beyond their social status; "trade was admirable as long as its exponents knew their place."[6]

During the eighteenth century, the economic competition between Britain and France exploded as each nation pursued colonies to augment their economic expansion. Becoming a world power took on new meaning for European countries as imperialistic policies affected more of the entire world than ever before. Economic competition had consequences that affected more than just the Western world and the phrase "foreign policy" had developed new facets. The idea of "world power" included both military strength and commercial profit, increasing the level of competition between Britain and France. Furthermore, commerce and war went hand in hand as both countries utilized their military strength to get ahead commercially, fighting for the dominance of trade routes as well as colonies that would provide profitable new markets. Regardless of who reigned supreme during the eighteenth century, economic competition remained at the center of British-French conflict; "trade was power."[7] Military exploits were

---

[6] Ibid, 59-61.

[7] Isabelle and Robert Tombs, *That Sweet Enemy: The French and the British from the Sun King to the Present* (London: William Heinemann, 2006), 112. Religion also played a role in the issues between Britain and France. Both *That Sweet Enemy* and *Britons* (11-55) discuss the role of religion in developing national identities in each country. However, for the purposes of this project, I focused on the commercial

interconnected with commercial ones as both Britain and France used their armies and navies to protect merchants on trade routes with known foreign competition. In financial terms, wartime efforts were largely funded and supported by the middle class. "Customs and excise taxes together supplied over 60 per cent of government revenue" and "just under 40 per cent of the cost of the American war came…from merchants, financiers, businessmen and women, and even minor shopkeepers and traders" in the form of long-term loans. In addition to financial support, the British navy relied on the merchant class for military support as it was continuously supplied with soldiers who had extensive naval experience due to their economic exploits.[8]

As seen in Chapter I, the middle class, which included successful merchants and craftsmen, often used food as a way to imitate the upper classes believing that "the food of the poor is known as 'simple and honest fare,'" while "the food of the affluent is…tainted by foreignness."[9] The hiring of foreign chefs and serving of foreign foods at the dinner table was the mark of wealth and power no matter the economic class you were in. Martha Bradley's *The British Housewife* published in 1760 begins with instructions on the necessities of a properly stocked kitchen. Bradley calls this section a "Chapter of Remembrance rather than instruction," a remark on the fact that good cooks should know what their kitchen needs. Bradley's lists of provisions and instructions for marketing show that British kitchens were often dependent on articles from all across the world. Her list of "principal spices used in England" includes cloves, mace, nutmeg,

---

aspects of the competition because this was reflected more in the analysis of British cookbooks during the eighteenth century. Cookbooks rarely, if ever, remarked on religion.

[8] Tombs, *That Sweet Enemy*, 64-65.

[9] Sidney Mintz, "The changing roles of food in the study of consumption," in *Consumption and the World of Goods*, ed. John Brewer and Roy Porter (New York: Routledge, 1993), 262.

cinnamon, ginger, pepper, and Jamaica pepper, all items that are found outside of Great Britain.

Although many of the characteristics of the middling class echoed those of the upper, landed class, they still retained some unique characteristics and values. In general, the middling sort was fiercely loyal to Great Britain since their livelihood depended on British primacy in an ongoing Anglo-French controversy that was ever apparent in the eighteenth century. Furthermore, they were more likely to depend on the traditional English qualities of practicality and economy, qualities that were not reflected in traditional French cuisine. Bradley's cookbook includes recipes that she calls "the most Elegant, yet least Expensive."[10] Charlotte Mason in 1773 assured her readers that her receipts were "by no means expensive," Mary Cole in 1788 reminded her readers that "the most frugal and least complicated dishes, are generally the most excellent," and Maria Rundell in 1816 wrote that "every one is to live as he can afford," providing entertainment suitable to the host's station and fortune.[11] As these examples show, frugality was one quality that never went out of style.

Even as Britain and France were fighting on the global stage, in Europe there was a constant peaceful exchange of ideas across the channel. Beginning especially in the seventeenth century, Britain was importing French literature, art, stage, and fashion. Social fashions were heavily influenced by France while Britain was exporting their

[10] Martha Bradley, *The British Housewife: or, the Cook, Housekeeper's and Gardiner's Companion* (London, 1760), 2.
[11] Charlotte Mason, *The Lady's Assistant for Regulating and Supplying Her Table, Being a Complete System of Cookery* (Dublin, 1777), iv.; Mary Cole, *The Lady's Complete Guide: or, Cookery in All its Branches* (London, 1788), ii.; Maria Rundell, *A New System of Domestic Cookery; Formed upon Principles of Economy* (London, 1816), v.

political ideologies and scientific and technological innovations.[12] Many French intellectuals were fascinated by Britain's constitutional monarchy in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries as well as the enlightened atmosphere that nurtured scientific experimentation and free thought.[13] This continual exchange occurred despite the Anglo-French competition that would shape the British commercial sector during the eighteenth century. Times of peace between France and Britain saw a huge amount of cross-Channel traveling, especially on the part of the British. This traveling was not discouraged by Versailles, even in periods post-war. The French considered their British visitors very rough around the edges but were also very eager to learn why the British were so prone to victory. British travelers were often seen as members of the *nouveau riche* although in reality those who had the money to travel generally came from the British gentry. During this exchange of both political and social ideas, "admiration and criticism went together."[14]

One of the French ideas that found its way to Britain was *nouvelle cuisine*, the French system of cooking, manners, and food ritual. Early French and British published cookbooks focused on discussing the art of *nouvelle cuisine,* promoting it between professional chefs. However, in Great Britain during the eighteenth century, cookbooks eventually began to shift away from primarily French cooking and focusing more on traditional British cooking. Authors began to profess experience in the "English art of

[12] Although there is a generalized association of France with luxury and the arts, and Britain with scientific innovation and industrialism, Maxine Berg cautions against generalizing too much. See her book *Luxury and Pleasure in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 91, for more information on Britain's efforts to produce comparable luxury goods of their own.
[13] Berg, *Luxury and Pleasure,* 55, 58, and 85.
[14] Ibid, 66.

cooking," developing a brand of cooking that was specifically English. This was a way for authors to state their preference for recipes that were more traditional and tied to their national identity, especially during a time when promoting English cuisine over French may have been opposing the current fashion. Hannah Glasse in 1747 made explicit comments about her negative opinions of French cuisine, the first to do so overtly, although she still included a good number of French recipes. As many authors were more cautious about their criticisms, the most identifying marker of national identity in these cookbooks is the decrease in the inclusion of French recipes. Cookbooks written before 1700 were almost entirely made up of recipes with French names and techniques. This was a result of two things: first, French cuisine was the most fashionable sort and dominated court cookery in England; second, at this time the commercially published cookbooks was still written primarily by male chefs who were either French or who had trained under French professionals. However, after the turn of the century, the number of French recipes in English cookbooks declined as women began to dominate the cookbook industry, with their experience as housewives and housekeepers affecting the content of the books and associating British cuisine with patriotism. As things heated up on a political and military stage between France and England, English subjects began boasting of their "Englishness," moving away from French cuisine and reverting back to traditional recipes, dominated by roasted meats. The frontispiece of Margaret Taylor's cookbook in 1795 was a drawing of several men seated around a dinner table. The title was "The Corporation Feast or O the Roast Beef of Old England."[15] The connection

[15] Margaret Taylor, *Mrs. Taylor's Family Companion; or, the Whole Art of Cookery Display'd* (London,

between business and nostalgia for "old England" is representative of the desire by many people within the middle classes to raise up what they considered traditional British cuisine. Political commentary used food as an example of Britain's commercial and military superiority over the French in cartoons and pamphlets. English food was "warmly nourishing and sustaining," which Britons believed was clearly superior to the extravagant, complicated, and insubstantial French cuisine.[16]

There were several kinds of French recipes that remained in cookbooks throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Sometimes, an author would explicitly state "the French way" when listing a recipe to denote its origins. Most often however, the author would use phrases that indicated a French technique. The most common were *à la daube*, *à la braize*, and *fricassée*. Although these terms were continually included in published cookbooks, by the time that authors like Maria Rundell were publishing in 1816 the terms had new definitions. What these three terms have in common is the tendency for British authors to apply them to recipes that did not follow the original French technique. The terms "daube" "braise" and "fricasey" became mainstream in the world of British cookery, with the definitions and spellings changing over time. Authors frequently adapted them to the availability of ingredients in Great Britain and anglicized the techniques to apply them to other processes.

1795), i.

[16] Colin Jones and Rebecca Spang, "Sans-culottes, sans café, sans tabac: shifting realms of necessity and luxury in eighteenth-century France," in *Consumers and Luxury: Consumer Culture in Europe 1650-1850* (New York: Manchester University Press, 1999), 42; Semmel, *Napoleon and the British*, 40.

Keeping the Audience in Mind

As discussed before, the merchant class had more of a reason to be loyal to Great Britain, and bear animosity toward the French, since their commercial livelihood depended on the economic success of Britain's industry within both domestic and international markets. Some of the cookbooks included here explicitly show their audience as being merchant families, while the others more generally direct their books to the middling class. *The Art of Cookery* by Hannah Glasse identifies part of her readership as being members the commercial sector of Britain. It includes an entire chapter titled "For Captains of Ships," including recipes with instructions on how to cook things in a ship's kitchen and recipes for preserving different vegetables and meats for the sea. Other chapters that deal with preserving and distilling include recipes with direct references to trading, such as "To preserve tripe to go to the East-Indies" or "The Jews way to pickle beef, which will go good to the West-Indies, and keep a year good in the pickle, and with care, will go to the East-Indies."[17] John Farley included a chapter similar to Glasse's titled "Necessary articles for sea-faring persons."[18] This section focused on catchups and sauces that were necessary for cooking aboard ships but would keep for long periods of time. Farley's recipe for "Catchup" would last twenty years if prepared in his manner, as opposed to Elizabeth Raffald's seven-year catchup. His fish sauce, however, would only last for one year but was still "useful in short voyages."[19]

[17] Hannah Glasse, *The Art of Cookery Made Plain and Easy* (London, 1747), 121-124.
[18] John Farley, *The London Art of Cookery, and Housekeeper's Complete Assistant* (Dublin, 1783), 318.
[19] Farley, *The London Art of Cookery*, 319; 320.; Raffald, *The Experienced English Housekeeper*, 318.

Not only did cookbooks often offer instructions to send things to the West-Indies, but they also included recipes brought back to Britain from there.[20] Uses of sugar from the West Indies, nutmeg from the Spice Islands, or other ingredients from the continent abound in Britain's published cookbooks, owing to the increase in ingredients more readily available in London. The increase in trade into London from other sections of Great Britain as well as the continent and colonies was due in part to the river and canal improvements in this period which allowed certain foods to be less of a luxury for the middle to upper classes.[21] Further, rather than selling the cookbook at a bookshop, Glasse's title page shows that her book was sold at a china-shop. Women would be less likely to frequent a bookshop and those purchasing china for an elegant dinner table would also be likely to buy a book with instructions on preparing fashionable and economic dishes.

B. Clermont's *The Professed Cook* published in 1769 listed several recipes that display the eclectic nature of cookbooks and the wide audience that they would appeal to. *The Professed Cook* included instructions to prepare certain recipes in a variety of fashions representative of the varied nature of the middling classes in Great Britain. Ten recipes were included for military use, which encompassed dishes like "Fillet of beef, admiral fashion," "Matlot fit for a general," and "Sausages, Sailor fashion." [22] Also included were eight recipes to be prepared in the "good house-wife's fashion," evidence

[20] Glasse, *The Art of Cookery Made Plain and Easy*, 331. "To dress a turtle the West-India way"
[21] Ken Albala, *Food in Early Modern Europe* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 2003), 181.; Joan Thirsk, *Food in Early Modern England: Phases, Fads, Fashions 1500-1760,* (New York: Hambledon Continuum, 2007), 158.
[22] B. Clermont, *The Professed Cook, or the Modern Art of Cookery, Pastry and Confectionary* (London, 1769), 77; 188; 157.

of the range of social stations that female readers could be, including housekeepers, housewives, and "Ladies" who played very little part in the preparation of the food. Finally, Clermont includes a recipe called "The Parson's sauce," the only recipe that references religion in his cookbook.[23] Recipes like this were very rare in published cookbooks and for the most part religion was left out of the culinary world in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

Elizabeth Raffald in *The Experienced English Housekeeper* included a recipe called "To make Portable Soup for Travellers" which she listed as being particularly useful for "Gentlemen's Families."[24] She also has a recipe called "To make a Catchup to keep Seven Years" which ends with an observation that "it will carry to the East-Indies."[25] Raffald's use of the term "Gentlemen" is evidence of the blurring of titles between social classes at this time. Although merchants did not rightly deserve the title "Gentleman" according to previous social standards, the loosening of the social hierarchy at the end of the eighteenth century meant that the definition of "gentleman" was more about aesthetics than breeding. Raffald may have been capitalizing on the redefinition of gentlemen that many successful merchants, investors, and businessmen were adapting during this period. Travelers going to the East-Indies with Raffald's "Portable Soup" and seven-year "Catchup" could very well have been referred to as "Gentlemen" in London's social circles around 1769, when her book was published.

[23] Clermont, *The Professed Cook,* 46.
[24] Elizabeth Raffald, *The Experienced English Housekeeper* (London, 1769), 3.
[25] Raffald, *The Experienced English Housekeeper*, 318.

This directing of published cookbooks to the merchant classes, dependent on the superiority of the British economy for survival, helps to explain why anti-French sentiment in these cookbooks was necessary for successful marketing. In order for a cookbook to sell the most copies, the author would need to make commentary appropriate for the merchant class and include recipes that this class would need, such as the recipes for use at sea. It also meant that authors were more likely to promote anti-French attitudes and British cuisine during particularly high periods of Anglo-French tension, since the merchant class would have the most to lose if Britain lost economic primacy. Patriotism was necessary for military victory as many of the merchant class took direct action against the French in naval roles, as well as in army units on the ground.

Criticism of the French

As seen in the previous chapter, animosity toward the French and their food was often dependent on the professional background of the stated author. In general, female-authored texts were more anti-French while male-authored texts were either overt in their appreciation of French cuisine or were at least less vocal about their dislike of it. As *nouvelle cuisine* was in vogue at court and amongst aristocratic families during the seventeenth and early eighteenth century, the use of the term "fashion" appeared to be consistent in referring to French food and the accompanying system of manners, *service à la francaise.* As such, "fashion" in published cookbooks in the latter part of the eighteenth century was often shrouded in a negative tone, implying extravagance and ostentation. "Elegance" became the ideal as it appeared to represent British values.

William Verral repeatedly listed recipes in the "fashion" of his patron, Monsier de St. Clouet, a French cook who worked for the Duke of Newcastle and under whom Verral studied. His use of the word "fashion" was associated with the French cook and he never used the term "elegant," a reflection, perhaps, of his appreciation for French cuisine rather than a preference of British food. John Thacker, an author who repeatedly stated his preference for English over French food, used the term fashion in association with "Bisques and Olios" which were dishes that came from France and Spain. He writes, "Bisques and Olios were much in Fashion formerly, but are not so now." His recipe for "Spanish Olio" begins with the statement, "I shall give you an Account of an Olio, but, in my Opinion a good English Hotch-potch is better."[26] While the association is subtle, Thacker seems to equate foreign and "fashion," referring to fashion in a negative way. The use of the word "fashion" was used to represent either a social trend or, in referring to a process, it was used to denote a specific identifier to particular recipes. Very often the phrases "French fashion," "English fashion," or "Dutch fashion" were attached to recipes to distinguish the background. When discussing social trends in the latter half of the eighteenth century, authors refrained from using the word "fashion" to describe something that was considered to be under British tradition rather than French. "Fashion" came to mean something that required ostentatious displays and large sums of money. Elegance, on the other hand, was British sophistication without wasting money.

The term "elegant" was increasingly found to represent the ideal that British households were striving for and the term was often found in close association to

[26] John Thacker, *The Art of Cookery* (Newcastle upon Tyne, 1758), 288; 239.

frugality. Sarah Harrison in 1733 told her readers that *The House-keeper's Pocket Book* included "instructions for preparing and dressing everything suitable for an Elegant Entertainment," ensuring that her recipes united "Frugality unto Elegance in Eating."[27] E. Taylor's book was "designed to fit out an Entertainment in an Elegant Manner, and at a Small Expence."[28] John Farley in 1783 assured his readers that "the greatest Care and Precaution have been taken to admit nothing inelegant" and even included a chapter titled "Elegant Ornaments for a Grand Entertainment."[29] Margaret Taylor in 1795 published a book that "[provided] the cheapest and most elegant set of Dishes in the various Departments of Cookery."[30] John Perkins assured his readers that "frugality and elegance were our constant conductors" in the compilation of recipes for *Every Woman Her Own Housekeeper.*[31] Mrs. Frazer was even careful to avoid the use of the term "fashion," instead telling her readers that the recipes included are "presently in vogue" and that she was careful to "reconcile simplicity with elegance, and variety with economy."[32] Alexander Hunter also avoids use of the term fashion, instead telling readers that cooks should be concerned with "[dressing] the meat according to the modern costume [*sic*], and afterwards to dish it up in an elegant manner."[33] Furthermore, the use of the word "elegant" was almost always used on the title page, a place where potential buyers would be sure to see it immediately suggesting its use as a prominent marketing tool.

---

[27] Sarah Harrison, *The House-keeper's Pocket Book and Compleat Family Cook* (London, 1733), i; vii.
[28] Taylor, *The Lady's, Housewife's, and Cookmaid's Assistant*, i.
[29] Farley, *The London Art of Cookery,* iv; 264.
[30] Taylor, *Mrs. Taylor's Family Companion,* i.
[31] John Perkins, *Every Woman Her Own Housekeeper; or, The Ladies' Library* (London, 1796), iv.
[32] Mrs. Frazer, *The Practice of Cookery, Pastry, Pickling, Preserving, &c* (London, 1790), iv; v.
[33] Alexander Hunter, *Culina Famulatrix Medicina; or Receipts in Modern Cookery* (York, 1806), 252.

Aside from these subtle references to the differences in French and British cuisine, between "fashionable" and "elegant" taste, some authors were very overt about their feelings toward the French and *nouvelle cuisine. The Art of Cookery Made Plain and Easy*, by Hannah Glasse, was first published in 1747, just eight years before the official start to the Seven Years War. Tensions were already high in the Americas and Europe and these were reflected in Glasse's book. Her clear dislike for the extravagance of French recipes was expressed in the introduction as she gave examples for areas where the French wasted money and time. In terms of patriotic cuisine, Anne Willan describes Glasse's pro-British sentiment in a clear and concise way, writing that "Mrs. Glasse…had her finger on the pulse of the nation, and her rhetoric was stridently anti-French, in tune with the debate about the debilitating qualities of French cuisine – with all its physical, financial, and even social costs."[34] Glasse first mentions the French in her introduction during a discussion about avoiding expense. She writes about French cooks in Britain who cooked meals with the most expensive ingredients possible, a testament to the "blind Folly of this Age, that [gentlemen] would rather be impos'd on by a French Booby, than give Encouragement to a good English cook."[35] She also talks about the expense of French cooking in Chapter III, which includes the subtitle "Read this Chapter and you will find how expensive a French Cook's Sauce is."[36] This is one of the first expressions of the paradox of using French recipes while still maintaining a sense of British loyalty in Britain's commercially published cookbooks. The next

[34] Anne Willan, et. al., *The Cookbook Library: Four Centuries of the Cooks, Writers, and Recipes That Made the Modern Cookbook* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012), 212.
[35] Glasse, *The Art of Cookery*, 2.
[36] Ibid, 53.

mention of French cuisine is a direct reference to possible criticism that she anticipates from using French names for recipes. Glass does not overtly critique the merits of these recipes, instead telling her readers that "whether they be call'd by a French, Dutch or English name, so they are good and done with as little Expence as the Dish will allow of." However subtle she attempts to be, she still replaced recipes for cullises or essences whose ingredients may be considered too French for substitutes that were more expensive.[37]

As mentioned before, the tendency for authors to emphasize British frugality over French expense never went out of fashion in published British cookery books. Nearly every cookbook author looked at for this project made some mention of their recipes being the cheapest allowable, while still maintaining elegance and taste. Although fashion dictated the necessity of serving French dishes, Glasse is clearly criticizing making recipes with traditional French methods. Several other sections of the cookbook also gesture to this by listing a recipe both in the French way and in the English way.[38] For example, in Chapter II, "Made-Dishes," she lists a recipe titled "To stew a Rump of beef," followed by another recipe titled "To stew a rump of Beef the French Way." Another example, one that appears in a later edition, is "To make white bread, after the London way" followed by "To make French bread." As Kate Coloquon phrases it, although Glasse did include recipes that were labeled with French techniques, these recipes were still "suffused with a very 'British' kind of cooking."[39] Many

[37] Ibid, 118-121.; Kate Coloquon, *Taste: The Story of Britain Through its Cooking* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2007), 200.
[38] Glasse, *The Art of Cookery*, 2; 22.
[39] Coloquon, *Taste,* 202.

cookbooks listed both French and British recipes side by side for readers to compare, often calling the British recipes "common" or "cheap" to highlight the expense of the French recipe. Elizabeth Cleland's *A New and Easy Method of Cookery* included a recipe for "Partridges à la Braise" that was twenty five lines long, twice as long as any other recipe in the chapter that included similar types of dishes. John Farley in 1783 takes a page from Glasse's book and lists "To make French Bread" directly after "To make white bread in the London manner," allowing readers to compare the two and come to a conclusion that the London manner is the best way.[40]

John Thacker published his cookbook in 1758, two years after the official start of the Seven Years War. Aside from Glasse, Thacker is the most overt about his anti-French sentiments. In fact, he even claims that many dishes with French names were "invented by the English; and the French Names have been given them to excite Curiosity."[41] Although most of his recipes are listed with a French name as well as an English one, his introduction tells readers that he includes them to prove his expertise, but still prefers recipes that were better for an "English stomach" and not "destructive to the English Constitution." Thacker tried to stay away from including recipes that were too expensive, telling readers that he wanted to avoid "Dishes a-la-mode de France, as they call them; in which the Mixture of Spices is so great, and the Expence so extravagant, that it frightens most people from using them." The French dishes that he felt obliged to include, illustrating his many years experience in the art of cookery, were

[40] Elizabeth Cleland, *A New and Easy Method of Cookery* (Edinburg, 1755), 96.; Farley, *The London Art of Cookery,* 309-310.
[41] John Thacker, *The Art of Cookery* (Newcastle Upon Tyne, 1758), preface.

dissected and used "such Ingredients as are healthful and pleasant to the Stomach."[42] Finally, the introduction attacks foreign cooks. Thacker tells his readers that in his experience he had the opportunity to work with cooks from several different nations, but he professes that he had never meant "a Foreigner who had so sound and good a Way of working as an old English Cook."[43]

Martha Bradley's cookbook published in 1760 had a different structure than the other books in that she provided a separate volume for each month of the year with each volume including chapters on marketing, provisioning, and cooking. As such, many of the recipes were replicated in many different months and it makes it a little more difficult to determine the number of French recipes that are included. However, the author's commentary throughout each section is definitely anti-French. In her section on cookery, the first four chapters are titled "Of Roasting," "Of Boiling," "Of Broiling," and "Of Frying." These sections are most generally essays on the basics of each technique, rather than a strict list of recipes, and therefore don't include the traditional recipe titles that would have been seen in other cookbooks from this period. The basic techniques described in these chapters are British rather than French, and we see no mention of the terms "daube" and "braise." The chapters regarding the table, "Of placing the Dishes" and "Of doing the Honours of a Table," discuss the *service a la francaise* that was very popular in this time. Bradley, however, writes in the introduction of each

[42] Thacker, *The Art of Cookery*, preface.
[43] Ibid., preface.

chapter that although the French way of doing things is the most "fashionable," it is inferior to "good old English Custom" which was "more obliging."[44]

For Alexander Hunter, editor of *Culina Fammulatrix Medicina* published in 1806, the cuisine of Great Britain was the most admirable, representing a "manly and national character." In accordance with the propaganda during the Napoleonic wars, food was often equated with gendered national characters. The British were portrayed as masculine through the consumption of roasted meats, strong gravies, and hearty puddings while the French were seen as feminine from eating thin soups and escargot. Hunter called roast beef the "pride and glory of this happy island," warning that if the people of "England discards Roast Beef," they would lose their identity.[45] Although he frequently referred to the parts of the kingdom separately, he still listed British recipes and ingredients as superior to those of the French. As editor of the cookbook, Hunter did not write any of the recipes included. They were, in fact, written by someone referred to as "Ignotus" but Hunter included his own personal observations and commentary for nearly every entry. His comments regularly included suggestions on replacing foreign ingredients with English ones, or how French recipes were very "troublesome." The recipe for "A French Soup," for example, included an observation that told readers "this is a most excellent tasted soup, but the preparation is attended with a great deal of trouble."[46] In line with his views on the greatness of roast beef, after the recipe that

[44] Bradley, *The British Housewife,* 69; 73.
[45] Hunter, *Culina Famulatrix Medicina*, 6.
[46]Ibid., 147.

describes the French way of roasting larks, Hunter says "perhaps it would be an improvement to fill the birds with forcemeat made of beef."[47]

Quantifying French Recipes

Because the inclusion of French recipes may have seemed unpatriotic, upon careful examination of the cookbooks French recipes are not actually that prominent. A useful illustration to help see how many recipes in published cookbooks between 1750 and 1850 is to identify significant Anglo-French conflicts during this period and look at the average number of recipes in each cookbook that would be considered "French." Three political flashpoints that are useful to look at here are the Seven Years War, the American War for Independence, and the Napoleonic Wars. Cookbooks published around these events, either just before the start, just after the end, or during the conflict itself, show us that during our time period the number of French recipes present in published cookbooks significantly decreased.

Around the time of the Seven Years War, the number of overtly French recipes in a cookbook, i.e. those that included a phrase similar to "in the French way," was on average about ten. The number of recipes that included a French technique was on average about twenty five, and the recipes themselves varied in terms of whether or not the instructions were true to the original meaning. Very often the recipes whose titles included "daube," "braise" or "fricassee" had been manipulated to reflect more of a British influence.[48] As Glasse and Cleland's books show, the recipe title may have used

[47] Ibid., 249.
[48] For a more complete discussion of how French techniques were modified, refer to the next section: "Anglicizing Recipes."

the French term but the instructions were closer to a traditional British preparation than the original French. The first edition of Glasse's cookbook had fifteen recipes with "French" in the title and an additional thirty that made use of a French technique. In 1755, just before the start of the Seven Years War, Elizabeth Cleland published *A New and Easy Method of Cookery.* Her cookbook had six recipes that explicitly stated the "French way" and eighteen recipes that included the phrases "daube," "braise" or "fricasee." Other foreign recipes, and recipes that had a British name associated with them, came out to a total of thirty two recipes. The rest of the recipes listed had no national or regional affiliation. In total, John Thacker had nine recipes with "French" in the title although occasionally there is an affiliation in the French translation of the recipe title but not in the French, suggesting a desire to remove French affiliation as much as possible.[49]

Authors that published around the time of the American War for Independence exhibited similar trends to those who published around the Seven Years War. On average, authors included in their books about three recipes that were listed as "the French way" and on average fourteen that were titled with French techniques. The recipes with French techniques in their titles were primarily "fricassees," with very few authors listing recipes titles with the words "daube" or "braise." However, those who did use these terms listed them with the explicitly French phrasing, i.e "à la daube" or "à la braize." Later authors would take away the French phrasing listing recipes simply as chicken "dobed" or "daubed," and veal "braised." Elizabeth Raffald in 1769 published a

[49] Thacker, *The Art of Cookery*, 201. Ex. "To make a green Sauce" is Thacker's English translation for "Sauce vert à la maniere Francoise."

cookbook with four recipes that were explicitly labeled "French" and fourteen with a French technique. Comparatively, she listed fourteen recipes that were explicitly British, attributing them to a specific British region, and three others that were attributed to a foreign nation other than France.[50] The rest of her recipes, which totaled over 700, had no affiliation and were given simple titles without any kind of foreign phrasing.[51] E. Taylor's *The Lady's, Housewife's, and Cookmaid's Assistant* published in 1769 had over 500 recipes total. Of these, only one recipe included the word "French" in the title and only ten used a French technique, all of them fricassees. At the same time, only seven of Taylor's recipes were listed with a British affiliation, choosing to list the other recipes with simple titles as well, and none had any other foreign affiliations. Charlotte Mason in 1773 also only had one with "French" in the title, but had nineteen which were listed with various French techniques. Of the other over 650 recipes, twenty nine had either a British affiliation or another national affiliation. Finally, John Farley in 1783 listed over 700 recipes in his *The London Art of Cookery*. Of these, seven had "French" in the title, seventeen were identified by French techniques, and twenty seven had either a British affiliation or some other foreign affiliation. Of those with French techniques in Farley's cookbook, fourteen were fricassees which were separated out and listed in their own chapter.

B. Clermont in his book *The Professed Cook* published in 1769, did not use the phrase "In the French way," or any variation of this, when listing French recipes. They

[50] For this project, any recipe that is listed with an affiliation of one of the British colonies that existed during this period is considered to be from a "British region" and not a "foreign country."
[51] In general, "simple title" refers to a technique such as "roasted," "boiled," "fried," etc. Although some of these recipes may have had origins in another country, they appear to have been completely anglicized and regarded as "simple fare" in that they were considered common without exoticism.

are instead named either by the French technique or are attributed to a specific city or region in France. Overall, he has forty two French recipes, compared to one hundred recipes with either British or other foreign names. *The Professed Cook* included seventeen British recipes, fourteen of which had the word "English" in the title, significantly different than the rest of the books used in this essay. This book was first published in 1769 and included just over 1,800 recipes. While it is not immediately clear why he had so many recipes categorized as English it was presumably because England and France had historically always been at odds. Although being a member of the British Empire did not necessarily mean you were "English," by 1769 Wales and Scotland were both components of Britain, English was still used to identify someone who lived there. This conflation of "English" and "British" is a problem that will be discussed more explicitly in the next chapter. For now, however, it is still evidence of Clermont's insistence of placing "English" cookery above French cookery.

Although many cookbooks published immediately before or during Anglo-French conflicts exhibited a decrease in the number of French included, we see the most significant change after the end of the Napoleonic Wars. Hannah Glasse, who first published *The Art of Cookery* before the Seven Years War in 1747, had fifteen recipes with "French" in the title while Maria Rundell who published in 1816, just after the end of the Napoleonic Wars, only had five French recipes. It was during this time that

political commentary often used food as an example of British superiority over the French, using cuisine related propaganda to bolster public support.[52]

Maria Rundell, published *A New System of Domestic Cookery* in 1816, with contents that showed her preference of British cuisine over French. Her list of recipes included only five recipes that explicitly stated that they were "French," and eleven that used the French techniques of "daube," "braise" or "fricassee." Similar to many earlier cookbooks, Rundell's versions of these French techniques had a significant British twist and manipulated the original definitions of the terms. Her "fricassees" were applied to many different kinds of meat and vegetables and her phrasing of the "braise" recipes suggest that the term had become so mainstream by this time in Great Britain that it had lost its original French association.[53]

William Kitchiner's *The Cook's Oracle*, which was published in 1817 a short three years after the end of the Napoleonic Wars, had only five "French" recipes; four were "fricassees" and the fifth was "Turnip Soup, the French way." *The Cook's Oracle* was written by a physician rather than a professional cook, unlike all of the other male-authored cookbooks from this period. As such, he had less motivation to prefer French cuisine over British cuisine, or vice versa. The preface of his book told readers that he only included recipes that encompassed what he called the "cardinal virtues of cookery, cleanliness, frugality, nourishment, and palateableness."[54] However because he was writing for a British audience we can therefore conclude that these were British virtues

[52] See Semmel, *Napoleon and the British*, for a more complete discussion of the role of political propaganda during wartime.
[53] i.e. "Fillet of mutton braised" versus earlier authors who use the phrase "a-la-braise." Rundell, *New System of Domestic Cookery,* 71.
[54] William Kitchiner, *Apicius Redivivus; or, the Cook's Oracle* (London, 1817), sig [A3r].

of cookery. His lack of French recipes suggests that French cuisine did not live up to these virtues. This was a belief that had been echoed in much of the political propaganda during the Napoleonic Wars.

Anglicizing Recipes

To understand more fully how recipes were manipulated to reflect a clearly British influence, we can look at those recipes in published cookbooks that included some version of "daube," "braise," or "fricassee." Starting out in France with one specific meaning, the terms became associated with many different processes in British cookbooks. *En daube* originally meant to prepare meat or vegetables in a pot with wine or vinegar to point up the flavor, and then taking the food out of the pot to be served dry without an accompanying sauce. In general, Elizabeth Cleland used italics when specifying a recipe that is part of a specific national cuisine. For example, Scots, Dutch, Polish, French, and Bologna are all used in various recipes and are all placed in italics to distinguish them. Her recipes that use the term "daube," however, never use italics in the recipe title. [55]A lack of consistency in this manner suggests that by 1755, "daube" was no longer considered a purely French technique. Rather, it was mainstream in the world of cookery and did not require a specific national attribution. John Farley's recipe for "Beef *à-la-daub"* instructed cooks to stew the beef for six hours with garlic, mushrooms, onions, and carrot with brown gravy completely covering it. After the six hours, the cook should skim off the fat and add white wine, vinegar and more vegetables, stewing for

[55] Cleland, *A New and Easy Method of Cookery*, "White *Scots* Collops" (62), "To make *Dutch* Beef" (51), "Tripes the *Polish* way" (74), "To dress a Pig the *French* way," (65) and "To make *Bologna* Sausages" (68).; Ex. "To dress Eels à la Daube" (29) and "Beef à la Daube" (49)

another hour. The recipe does not, however, give instructions on how to serve the dish and whether the gravy should be siphoned off the meat and vegetables before serving.[56] In the nineteenth century, *daube* lost its original meaning and began to be applied only to meat and recipes occasionally called for the meat to be served with the accompanying liquid from the pot. Maria Rundell in 1816 included a recipe for "Veal a-la-daube" which was very different from Farley's in 1783. Instead of stewing the meat and vegetables in gravy with white wine and vinegar, the meat was covered in broth and bacon and simmered in a frying pan for two hours. It was then served with a sorrel-sauce.[57] By the time Rundell published, the term *à la daube* had already lost much of its original meaning.

Braise is a term that is almost always applied to meat dishes and is close to what modern cooks call a "pot-roast." The eighteenth century technique referred to first searing the meat to brown the surface and then placed in a covered dish with some sort of liquid covering at least two thirds of the product. The dish was then cooked at a very low temperature until the meat became tender. The liquid was then generally used in a sauce or gravy to accompany the meat when it was served.[58] E. Taylor's recipe for "Chickens à la braise" from her 1769 cookbook used this method. She instructed cooks to use a deep stew pan with layers of veal, bacon, and onions underneath the chicken and covered in water. After simmering for an hour, the chicken would be ready to serve and the liquid used in a ragoo to accompany the dish.[59] Rundell's "Fillet of Mutton braised,"

---

[56] Farley, *The London Art of Cookery*, 69.
[57] Rundell, *A New System of Domestic Cookery*, 47.
[58] Alan Davidson, ed. *Oxford Companion to Food* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 244.
[59] Taylor, *The Lady's, Housewife's, and Cookmaid's Assistant,* 49-50.

however, instructs cooks to roast the mutton for two hours without any kind of liquid and then serve it over French beans in gravy.[60] Again, Rundell's version of "braise" shows that the technique had changed by the turn of the nineteenth century.

A French method of cooking called *fricassee* referred to frying meat, generally chicken, in oil at low temperatures to keep it white instead of browning.[61] British cookbook authors generally wrote it as "fricasey" and applied to it many types of food beyond chicken, changing the process to either brown the meat rather than keeping it white or excluding frying altogether.[62] Charlotte Mason in 1773 included a recipe for "Eggs fricaseed" in her cookbook. The instructions tell readers to hard boil an egg and serve it with a boiled gravy made up of cream, flour, butter, mushrooms, and various herbs and spices. Not only does Mason apply the term *fricassee* to something other than chicken, the instructions include no mention of frying the egg in oil.[63]

John Thacker anglicized his recipes in a different way in his cookbook published in 1755. All of his recipes were listed with both an English title and a French translation. However, the translations didn't often match up exactly to the English title, occasionally including or excluding a regional affiliation. For example, a pea soup recipe is listed as "To make Peas-Soup" and "Potage aux Pois à l'Angloise," with the French name most directly translating as "Pea Soup the English way." At the same time, two recipes that include a reference to Devonshire in the English title do not have the affiliation in the

[60] Rundell, *A New System of Domestic Cookery,* 71.
[61] Davidson, *Oxford Companion to Food*, 320; Albala, *Food in Early Modern Europe,* 96.
[62] Glasse, *The Art of Cookery.* Some examples are: "to make a brown fricasey," "to fricasey rabbits, lamb, sweet-breads, or tripe," or "a fricasey of kidney beans."
[63] Mason, *The Lady's Assistant*, 231.

French translation.[64] In all of the instances of the translations not matching up there is some kind of regional affiliation that did not translate between the two languages, telling us that there were obvious differences in how the British and the French viewed specific dishes.

In addition to the anglicization of French techniques, some authors went even further by replacing foreign ingredients with British alternatives. Sometimes the author made no mention of this replacement, implying that they had most likely learned the recipe with the British ingredient in the first place. However, some authors, like Alexander Hunter, provided his readers with notes for each recipe suggesting changes and improvements to the original recipes written by a cook named Ignotus. Very often, this commentary included suggestions of using a British ingredient rather than a foreign one. His replacement of foreign ingredients did not just include things considered too French, but also indicated a change in the perception of foreign cuisine overall. For example, for almost every recipe that calls for Parmesan cheese Hunter recommends replacing it with "cheese of our own country." In fact, *Culina Famulatrix Medicina* has four different recipes for "Macaroni," all originally calling for the use of Parmesan and all containing a note from Hunter telling the reader to replace it with either Cheshire Cheese or a cheese "known by the name of 'Trent Bank.'"[65] Hunter apparently felt that British loyalty meant cutting out any kind of dependence on foreign goods, instead pushing British goods first and foremost.

---

[64] Thacker, *The Art of Cookery*, "To make a Squob Pye as they make it in Devonshire / Paté de Pigeoneaux" on page 127, and "To make Clouted Cream, as it is made in Devonshire / Crème brouillé" on page 136.
[65] Hunter, *Culina Famulatrix Medicina* 19; 27; 56; 70.

Many of the cookbook authors frequently recommend the replacement of foreign goods with British ones, like Hunter's replacement of Parmesan cheese. Other others who recommended the disuse of Parmesan were William Verral in 1759 and Charlotte Mason in 1773 who both preferred Cheshire Cheese.[66] This is in comparison to Clermont in 1769 who included ten recipes that called for Parmesan cheese.[67] Although the recipe for "Macarony Soop," which calls for Parmesan Cheese, does mention that Cheshire Cheese can be used instead, it is in the interest of frugality rather than loyalty to British goods.[68] Where Hunter routinely refers to "the cheese of our country," Clermont simply says that Cheshire can be used if you wish to "save Parmesan Cheese" for another use. The publication date may provide us with an explanation as to why some authors chose to recommend a decrease in the dependence on Parmesan. Verral's publication date of 1759 places his cookbook in the middle of the Seven Years War, a time when British supremacy over France was the main goal but global interests were also at play. The Seven Years War has occasionally been termed the first "world war" since it played out on an international stage and involved many different European players. Although it wasn't necessarily Britain against the world, the economic basis for the war suggests that British citizens may have been more inclined to profess patriotic loyalties through an insistence on using home-grown goods. The modern phrase "buy local" is reminiscent of the Britons' desire to support their home economy rather than continually importing goods from places like Italy or France. Similarly when Charlotte

[66] William Verral, *A Complete System of Cookery* (London, 1759), xx.; Mason, *The Lady's Assistant,* 234.
[67] Clermont, *The Professed Cook*, 56; 58; 60; 122; 163; 217; 351; 372; 446; 458. These include recipes like "Beef's palates and Parmesan," "Omelette with Parmesan-cheese, &c.," and "Small chitterlings with Parmesan cheese."
[68] Clermont, *The Professed Cook,* 23.

Mason was promoting Cheshire cheese in 1773 the British government was dealing with backlash from their thirteen American colonies. A resistance to mercantilism by the colonies could have resulted in a Loyalist insistence on the use of British goods in order to set an example for those who wanted free markets.[69] Mrs. Frazer's recipe for "A Macaroni Pie" in 1791 includes Parmesan cheese as one of the ingredients but also includes a note that "good double Gloucester cheese" would work just as well as Parmesan.[70]

There are three possibilities for why authors chose to replace Parmesan with Cheshire although there is not enough evidence here to understand all the motives behind why it happened. It could have been that experts in the field of cuisine recognized that Cheshire cheese really did do better in Macaroni recipes than Parmesan. Or, from a practical perspective, the naval warfare during the Seven Years War likely made it extremely difficult to get Parmesan cheese, as merchants were often required to assist with the war and blockades occurred in many ports along the trade routes. Finally, the 1773 replacement by Charlotte Mason could be evidence of an ideological aversion to Parmesan cheese based on patriotic loyalty. Although we do not have enough evidence to support a conclusion about why authors were replacing Parmesan with a cheese made in Great Britain, it did occur in British cookery books at various times throughout this period, interspersed with authors who do not write in alternatives to Parmesan. This means that cooks as a rule did not necessarily think that Parmesan was

[69] For a more complete discussion of British mercantilist policies in the eighteenth centuries see the article by Steve Pincus. "Rethinking Mercantilism: Political Economy, the British Empire, and the Atlantic World in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries," in *The William and Mary Quarterly* 49 (2012): 3-34.
[70] Frazer, *The Practice of Cookery,* 103.

better or worse than British cheese and the replacement in cookbooks was probably due to one of the other two possibilities discussed here.

An emphasis on the quality of British cuisine during the Napoleonic Wars also affected how much importance was placed on regional preferences. With a decrease in the importance of French food, there was more opportunity to point out differences in the cuisine of Great Britain's various components. Rundell's *A New System of Domestic Cookery* provides evidence of the importance of regional differences within Great Britain. In 300 pages of recipes, seven have overtly French titles while thirty seven have recipes attributed to some part of the Great Britain, including Scotland, Ireland, Wales, and various English cities and counties. While Rundell provides no specific commentary on French versus British cuisine, the variety of recipes that represent Great Britain itself is very telling. However, the breadth of representation from all parts of Great Britain is also cause for question during a time when national loyalty was imperative to winning a war against the French. The British government would have encouraged national patriotism over regional loyalties by "other-izing" the French and promoting the development of a strictly "British" identity. Rundell's book, which will be more carefully analyzed in the next chapter, is evidence of growing concern within Great Britain over the conflation of "English" with "British" and the desire for non-English citizens to protect their cultural identities.

CHAPTER IV

ENGLISH OR BRITISH?

THE IMPORTANCE OF REGIONAL DISTINCTIONS

As historians venture into the world of food to analyze cultural and social trends they are forced to grapple with the fact that finding a uniform language to address this discussion can be challenging. States who are continually searching for a way to define their national identity rely on uniformity so that their citizens are able to find commonalities provide consistent support for the state. Questions that often drive historians regarding nationality include how people identify themselves in relation to the sovereignty of the nation that they are subjects of, as well as how individuals identify with one another in a place where regionalism may have a large influence over identity. Eighteenth century Britain, for example, a place where subjects were simultaneously trying to define their nationality, identifying both with Great Britain as a whole and the various regional elements within it. England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales all maintained distinct cultural differences, yet the tendency for people to conflate "English" and "British" exists throughout history.

This conflation has been reviewed by many prominent authors, including Linda Colley and Robert and Isabelle Tombs, but has also been a trap for historians themselves to fall into.[1] Since England held the most power within Great Britain it was common for

[1] Semmel very often uses "British" and "English" interchangeably. For example, in a discussion of liberty he writes "They would use Napoleon to demonstrate the fragility of British liberties," and two sentences

people to interchange "English" and "British" when describing their political or social culture. In imperial terms, the English were held up as the civilized ideal even though the British actors in the colonies could be Welsh, Scottish or Irish. This tension between the cultural identities existent within Great Britain is found in published cookbooks from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. These books show a growing regionalism within Great Britain even as Anglo-French conflict was supposedly creating a unified Britain. A "patriotic" emphasis on British recipes was complicated as recipe titles tended to reflect more of a regional influence rather than using generic "British" recipe titles. In all of the cookbooks examined, Martha Bradley was the only author who used "British" in her title, *The British Housewife,* and Sarah Martin's *The New Experienced English-Housekeeper* and Elizabeth Raffald's *The Experienced English House-keeper* were the only two who used "English" in their titles. The only other regional identifier used in a cookbook title is London which was the cultural center of England.[2] Even with Bradley's use of British in her title, the information she offers her readers is based on thirty years experience "in every Article of English Housewifery" and any notes regarding recipes or table services always refer to the "English" way of doing things.[3] For the most part, authors used the identifier "English" when discussing cookery of Great Britain. This shows a conflation of "English" as the national identifier for the

later, "Reformers believed the very hallmarks of English liberty…were under fire." Stuart Semmel, *Napoleon and the British* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), 203. This is representative of the difficulty, even today, of distinguishing between "English" and "British" since they have historically been considered the same.

[2] Martha Bradley, *The British Housewife: or, the Cook, Housekeeper's, and Gardiner's Companion* (London, 1760); Sarah Martin, *The New Experienced English-Housekeeper, for the Use and Ease of Ladies, Housekeepers, Cooks, &c* (Doncaster, 1795); Elizabeth Raffald, *The Experienced English House-keeper, for the Use and Ease of Ladies, House-keepers, Cooks, &c.* (Dublin, 1769); John Farley, *The London Art of Cookery and Housekeeper's Complete Assistant* (London, 1783).

[3] Bradley, *The British Housewife*, i.

whole of Great Britain, an idea that would make it difficult for the Scots, the Irish, and the Welsh to maintain their regional uniqueness in the British Empire.

There were certainly benefits to national loyalty, seen in the previous chapter, as commercial interests were intimately connected to patriotism for the middling class. Supporting the good of Great Britain as a whole ensured that political and economic primacy on the world stage. However, after the Jacobite Rebellion of 1745, the lines between the cultures of Great Britain became more distinct as people of Irish and Scottish descent began to push back at what it meant to be "British." An Act passed in 1747 by Parliament outlawed the wearing of tartan and Highland dress as part of a punishment for the 1745 rebellion. It was enacted largely as a means for suppressing the aspects of Scottish culture that were identified as fostering rebellion, and discouraging any act that made people of Britain seem less dedicated to the "British" identity. The act was repealed in 1782 only through the efforts of the Highland Society of London.[4] The tendency for political powers to prioritize English traditions over Irish or Scottish when promoting Great Britain abroad alienated the non-English peoples of the kingdom. Although Great Britain was officially a Protestant nation, Catholicism was still alive in certain parts of the kingdom, encouraging French interference into the internal issues of Britain. Differences between official policy and the very real distinctions within the

[4] "Act of Proscription," Education Scotland, accessed February 19, 2014, http://www.educationscotland.gov.uk/scotlandshistory/jacobitesenlightenmentclearances/actofproscription/index.asp.

kingdom contributed to the blurred lines between colonized and colonizers, individual and national identity.[5]

Our modern conception of Great Britain grew out of three separate legislative measures where England established unions with Wales, Scotland, and Ireland. These unions were motivated by mostly political reasons, often when an English monarch anticipated a threat to his or her authority, but economic motivations played their part as well. Scotland and Ireland had been economically connected to England even before their respective Acts of Union. Because of this, the union was often in the commercial best interest of the Scots and the Irish, while England was most often interested in official political authority over the regions. The success of business and industry in Great Britain during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries was partially dependent on establishing colonies to open new markets. "Welsh farmers and missionaries, Scottish engineers and doctors, Irish soldiers and merchants" all contributed to the efforts on the ground to establish and maintain British colonies for the good of the Empire.[6] Politics and economics united the peoples of Great Britain while social and cultural distinctions differentiated them.

While there is not enough conclusive evidence to suggest that authors considered the kingdom where they lived to be Great Britain, the general assumption is that by at least 1745, after the last Jacobite uprising from Scotland, the majority of the population would have accepted this fact. Although only two authors explicitly label

[5] See Denis Judd, *Empire: The British Imperial Experience from 1765 to the Present* (New York: Harper Collins, 1996).; See also Chapter 7, "The Fortunate Isle," in Paul Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People: England 1727-1783* (New York: Clarendon Press, 1989).
[6] Judd, *Empire*, 2.

their homeland as "Great Britain," we can infer that at least those authors who published in the post-1745 period would have considered themselves subjects of Great Britain. That being said, their insistence on referring to their cookery as "English" is evidence of the conflation of British to mean English. This would prove to be extremely problematic, especially in later years as the British Empire expanded and attempted to incorporate new peoples as their subjects. The use of "English" and "British" interchangeably suggests that those who considered themselves English versus Scottish or Welsh prided themselves on being the most modern and civilized members of the country. It also represented a tension that resulted from imperialistic rhetoric as colonizers attempted to civilize, or make more "English," the populations that they encountered abroad.[7] As the British government was "English-izing" its colonies, the people within Great Britain who were not explicitly English found themselves struggling to stay on equal terms.

Even so, at least until the end of the eighteenth century, cookbook authors show a tendency to prefer regional uniqueness to that of the entire British Empire. Instead of changing recipes to say either "English" or "British," they retained regional distinctions, showing that an "English art of cookery" was not as important to them as cookery styles distinctive to specific areas of Great Britain. The preference for regional differences in cookbooks shows that although Great Britain had technically been established in 1707 and had included Ireland since 1801, subjects tended to frame their identity regionally rather than in terms of the entire kingdom. After all, during a time when good

[7] For further discussion on this theory of "English" as "civilized" with the British Empire, especially later on during the Imperial Age, see: Antoinette Burton, *Burdens of History: British Feminists, Indian Women and Imperial Culture, 1865-1915*, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994); Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707-1837* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992); Catherine Hall, *Civilizing Subjects: Metropole and Colony in the English Imagination, 1830-1867,* (Chicago, 2002); etc.

communication was difficult over a large area, some English counties were often influenced more by Scotland or Wales than their own cultural center of London. Northumberland, for example, was closest to Scotland and its people were more culturally parallel to the Scots whereas Shropshire and Herefordshire felt a kinship with Wales.[8] However, Britons were also more aware than ever of the growing influence of the British Empire and what it meant to be a part of it. Although cookbooks show evidence of the desire to prepare meals that represented specific parts of Great Britain, the increasing use of ingredients and recipes from abroad show a widening appreciation for foreign and exotic foods encountered through trade and colonization.

In this way, cookbooks serve a dual nostalgic purpose. During a period of increased urbanization people were moving into the cities from rural areas all around Great Britain. As young people left their homes, food became a way to battle their homesickness. Appealing to people's nostalgia would be a way to sell published cookbooks especially through word of mouth, a common marketing strategy. However, similar to how authors emphasized a national cuisine, there were often times when regional loyalties were more popular than national ones. B. Clermont in 1769 published a cookbook with fifteen recipes that included "the English way" in their title, the only recipes that were distinctly British as opposed to foreign or French. Elizabeth Raffald in the same year published a cookbook with eleven British recipes representing both Scotland and four different English counties. Clermont's sole of "English" as an identifier and Raffald's use of several different regions in Britain, in the same year, is an

[8] Colley, *Britons,* 16.

example of the different ways authors expressed distinctions.[9] It was the same for people travelling around the empire. Colonial officials or members of the army and navy who travelled during wartimes could look to their cooks for reminders of home, providing their employees with a published cookbook from Great Britain. Several authors provide specific sections for how to prepare food for long voyages at sea, such as Hannah Glasse in 1747 and John Farley in 1783.[10] Farley's recipes focus on preparing mushrooms and catchup to add to fried and boiled meat dishes while Glass includes these and around twenty five other recipes that include "A Cheshire Pork Pye for Sea" and eight traditional British recipes for puddings.[11]

Jon Holtzman tells us of another kind of nostalgia that is not necessarily for something that you have lost or for a memory you have, but instead for something you want to know or experience and have not had the chance to. As he puts it, "it may also be seen as a longing for times and places that one has never experienced," calling it "armchair nostalgia."[12] For people of the British Empire, food was a way to experience parts of the empire that contributed to their British identity but that they had never experienced firsthand. For example, while British citizens may have spent time reading travel narratives of places like the Americas or India, most of the population had never been there personally. The published cookbooks during this period are filled with recipes whose ingredients were brought back from these places, including spices like Jamaica

[9] B. Clermont, *The Professed Cook: or, the Modern Art of Cookery, Pastry, and Confectionary* (London, 1769).; Raffald, *The Experienced English Housekeeper*.
[10] Hannah Glasse, "For Captains of Ships," *The Art of Cookery made Plain and Easy* (London, 1747), 121; John Farley, "Necessary articles for sea-faring persons," *The London Art of Cookery*, 318.
[11] Glasse, *The Art of Cookery*, 123-125.
[12] Jon Holtzman, "Food and Memory," *Annual Review of Anthropology,* 35 (2006), 367.

pepper, cayenne pepper, and nutmeg. Authors also included various recipes like "Virginia Trouts," and "To dress Chickens the Barbary Way," giving people an opportunity to experience different regional cultures from within the British Empire as a whole. [13]

Historical Context

Even as major political events affected how the population of Great Britain viewed French cuisine, other events had an influence over how authors expressed regional preferences in cuisine. The creation of Great Britain was a long and complicated process. The kingdom began with England and grew to encompass three other components, each with unique cultural and political aspects. Wales, Scotland, and Ireland each had historical connections with England but it wasn't until 1801 that all four parts were combined into a single state and a united kingdom. As evidenced by events such as the '45, which will be discussed later, even an official proclamation and political act was not always enough to convince everyone to get along.

Wales was annexed by England under the Laws in Wales Acts of 1535-1542. Although the English had conquered Wales 300 years earlier, it wasn't until these Acts that the legal system of England was extended to Wales in order to create a single state. From the conquest of Gwynedd in 1282 Wales had retained its own administrative system. Previous to the Acts, Welsh law was dominated by the marcher lordships. The change was made when Henry VII began to perceive a threat from some of the marcher

[13] John Thacker, *The Art of Cookery* (Newcastle upon Tyne, 1758), 128; 161.; Sarah Harrison, *The House-keeper's Pocket Book and Compleat Family Cook* (London, 1733), 2; Harrison mentions "Jamaica Pepper" in her discussion of what a cook should keep regularly stocked in her kitchen. A modern-day definition of "Jamaica Pepper" is "Allspice," according to the Oxford English Dictionary.

lords in Wales and decided that continuity between the administrative norms of England and Wales was needed, leading to a modern English sovereign state. The Acts abolished these lordships as political units and created five new counties to replace them, making 13 total Welsh counties. Wales was also allowed to elect members to the English Parliament in order to ensure representation. The counties of Wales were subject to English criminal law but Welsh law was used for civil cases until the Laws in Wales Acts. Although the union ensured that England and Wales shared the same legal system and religious organization, and Wales had no specific cultural center of its own like London or Edinburgh, the Welsh did have their own language to set them apart. Although language seemed to be the single unique aspect of Wales, they still maintained a distinction as Welsh, culturally distancing themselves from England.[14]

In 1707 Scotland joined with England and Wales to create the kingdom of Great Britain. The two states had shared a monarch since 1603, but had maintained separate legislatures. The union was an opportunity for England to ensure that Scotland did not choose a monarch separate from its own (at the time Queen Anne). The Scots were motivated to join the united kingdom of Great Britain because they were facing a time of financial strain. Uniting with England seemed a viable option to help relieve this burden. Furthermore, their recent affiliation with France during the Glorious Revolution, the first Jacobite uprising, was strong motivation for Scotland to cement its place as England's "privileged partner."[15] The differences between Scotland and England were more

[14] Colley, *Britons*, 13.
[15] Robert and Isabelle Tombs, *That Sweet Enemy: The French and the British from the Sun King to the Present,* (London: William Heinemann), 2006, 31.

distinct than those between England and Wales. Although the Scots were now represented in England's Parliament rather than maintaining their own, they still kept a unique religious organization and social structure, as well as their own legal and educational systems. The majority of the English population was more opposed to this union since the Scots had been on their own for much longer than Wales had been. Furthermore, the creation of "Great Britain" meant losing an identity as English to some, even if it was not always so explicit. For the most part, Englishmen resisted the change because they saw the Scots as opportunistic and selfish, looking to gain access to English resources but unwilling to become "English" themselves.[16]

The Jacobite Rebellion of 1745, also referred to as "The Forty Five," occurred when the Stuart family attempted to retake the throne in England. Charles Edward Stuart, grandson to the deposed King James II (in Scotland, King James VII), travelled through Scotland to England with an army of highland lords and followers. James had been deposed because of his connections to the Catholic faith, leading him to seek support from France. Although the Stuart family had historically had help from France, Charles did not utilize large French forces in his campaign. The Jacobites were initially successful in their campaign through Scotland, but they were defeated after having to retreat from England because of the overwhelming size of the Hanoverian forces. During The Forty-Five, and in the immediate aftermath, Scots were portrayed as barbaric and savage by the English.[17] Although this particular rebellion had occurred nearly forty years after the Act of Union that had intended to unite Scotland and England, the

[16] Colley, *Britons,* 13.
[17] Colley, *Britons*, 83.

portrayal of Scots as categorically different from the English had a negative impact on "British" identity.

Finally, the union between Ireland and England took effect in 1801 after the 1800 Acts passed by the Parliament of Great Britain and the Parliament of Ireland. Before these acts, the two states had been under the same monarch since 1542 when the Irish Parliament proclaimed King Henry VIII of England to be King of Ireland. Although the Irish Parliament had restrictions placed on it by the Parliament of England, Ireland gained more and more legislative independence from Great Britain, especially after the Constitution of 1782. The Irish Rebellion of 1798, which had been inspired by the French Revolution of 1789 and assisted by the French government, raised serious concern in Great Britain and motivated the British government to seek an official union with Ireland. With the dissolution of the Irish Parliament, Ireland gained over one hundred representatives in the British Parliament. The Acts also confirmed a united Protestant church, which grew out of a concern that the Catholic population of Ireland would be influenced by and partial to France. Roman Catholics, although officially given the right to vote and serve as parliamentary representatives through these Acts, were blocked from emancipation until 1829.

The Jacobite Rebellion occurred nearly forty years after the 1707 Act of Union that united Scotland and England. This rebellion led to a re-evaluation of the English opinion of Scottish people. The 1801 Act of Union between Ireland and Great Britain also influenced the representations of the different cultures within Britain. These types of events influenced how regional cuisines were portrayed in published cookbooks. As

cultural stereotypes were emphasized during events like those in 1745 and 1801, regional recipes gained popularity as "British" identity became less important than specific English, Scottish, or Irish identities.

Language of the Introductions

One of the interesting trends in the genre of cookbooks between 1750 and 1850 was the increasing tendency for authors to include variations of common recipes that were attributed to a particular region of Great Britain. As the anti-French attitudes of the authors were often shaped by Anglo-French conflicts, so regional loyalties were affirmed and bolstered by events like the Acts of Union and the '45 in Britain's history. Although "British" patriotism gained traction as conflict heated up between Britain and France, regional distinctions never lost their importance. Above all, however, the most consistent trend over time and between authors is the insistence on referring to their cookery as "English" while still including regionally distinct recipes. Britons appeared to still frame their identity within the confines of regional distinction rather than in terms of "Great Britain." However, that is not to say that they weren't more aware than ever of the growing influence of the British Empire and what it meant to be a part of it. After gaining French territory in the Seven Years War the majority Protestant population of Great Britain were forced to confront the possibility of new fellow subjects from the previously French Canada being Catholic. The ever widening British Empire also meant that the space between the metropole and its peripheries made it more difficult to have everyone identify as "English." It also represented a tension that resulted from imperialistic rhetoric as colonizers attempted to civilize, or make more "English," the

populations that they encountered abroad.[18] As the British government was "English-izing" its colonies, the people within Great Britain who were not explicitly English found themselves struggling to stay on equal terms.

It is in the introductions and prefaces that we often see regional tensions expressed clearly. As mentioned before, Martha Bradley's cookbook for British housewives was dependent on her experience as an English housewife, and she continually wrote her notes and instructions in relation to what was "English" instead of the all-encompassing "British." Even before Bradley published, Sarah Harrison in 1733 wrote a cookbook directed to the "House-wives in Great Britain."[19] Her introduction is the only one that explicitly defines her audience as "British" but she doesn't expand on this. Although she may have been appealing to readers that supported the 1707 union and the creation of Great Britain, there is nothing in the rest of her introduction or her recipes to say that she believed that "Great Britain" meant the establishment of a cuisine that was an all-encompassing "British." In fact, her introduction goes on to describe the differences between the city and the country, stressing that those who lived in the large urban centers were categorically different from the rural populations, and she believed that her book would be most useful in a rural setting.[20] The rural populations had less access to particularly exotic ingredients and generally had less use for formal dinner services.

---

[18] Burton, *Burdens of History*; Colley, *Britons;* Hall, *Civilizing Subjects*; etc.
[19] Harrison, *The House-keeper's Pocket Book*, sig. [A2r].
[20] Harrison states that "the Country is the Place where generally Works of this Nature are best Received." *The House-keeper's Pocket Book,* xii.

Hannah Glasse in 1747 frequently calls her audience "English," referring to an "English Lord," a "good English cook," and recipes with "English names."[21] John Thacker's *The Art of Cookery* was published in Newcastle in 1758 and describes his recipes as being the most appropriate for an "English Constitution." His preface also describes his particular attention to the differences in the "northern parts" and "southern parts" of the kingdom, although he doesn't specifically say what regions these parts encompass. Scotland was often referred to as the northern part of Britain so it is very possible that here he groups the northern English counties with Scotland, yet still describes his audience as having an "English constitution." Furthermore, he describes his most positive cooking experience as those working with "English Cooks," saying that he had never "met a with a Foreigner who had so sound and good a Way of working as an old English Cook," preferring a "profess'd Hotch-Potch" to foreign cuisine. Although Thacker may have specifically meant English cooks, and not cooks from any part of Britain, his use of "Hotch-Potch" as an example is significant since this dish was best known in Lancashire and Scotland.[22] The cookbook by Mrs. Frazer even lists one recipe as "Scotch Soup, or Hotch Potch."[23] Thacker's preface includes the requisite explanation of why this book is better than the rest which includes a regional aspect. He calls out the books that were published in London, saying that they are "far short of being generally useful, especially in these Northern Parts, where the Seasons occasion such Alterations in the Bills of Fare for each Month, from those calculated for the Southern Parts."[24]

---

[21] Glasse, *The Art of Cookery,* ii.
[22] Alan Davidson, ed. *Oxford Companion to Food* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 389.
[23] Mrs. Frazer, *The Practice of Cookery, Pastry, Pickling, Preserving, &c* (Edinburgh, 1781), 8.
[24] Thacker, *The Art of Cookery,* Preface.

Up until the nineteenth century there was even inconsistency in measurements. Although the 1707 Act of Union officially replaced Scotland's system of measures with the English one, Scottish units of measure continued to be used colloquially. Elizabeth Cleland's recipes in *A New and Easy Method of Cookery* use both English and Scottish measurements. Her instructions on how "To make a strong Broth for Soups or Sauces" require "four *English* Gallons of Water" while the recipe for "Plumb Broth" requires "six *Scots* Pints of Water."[25] In Mrs. Frazer's book, published in Edinburgh thirty six years after Cleland's, the author reminds us that even by 1791 there was not consistency in measurements. At the end of the table of contents there is a small note reminding readers that "the liquid measure here is given in Scotch; but it can in a minute be reduced into English."[26] Even so many years after the Act of Union between Scotland and England, both were operating under very different units of measure. Frazer's note is also evidence of the fact that not everyone in Great Britain automatically equated "British" and "English." Since this book was published in Edinburgh, it makes sense that the measurements given would be in Scottish terms. However, if all of Scotland had conformed to an English standard after entering into the kingdom of Great Britain, Frazer would have most likely been using English measurements even if she was from Scotland. William Kitchiner in 1817 recommended that all cooks purchase glass measures from specific sellers in London in order to be as consistent as possible in their measures.[27] London as the *economic* hub of Great Britain would have included people

[25] Elizabeth Cleland, *A New and Easy Method of Cookery* (Edinburgh, 1755), 1; 5.
[26] Frazer, *The Practice of Cookery*, xiii.
[27] William Kitchiner, *Apicius Redivivus; or, The Cook's Oracle* (London, 1817), sig. [B9v].

from all over Great Britain, and people who would have used many different types of measures. Therefore his advice to buy glass measures in London tells us that he was recommending using English measurements since London was considered the *cultural* hub of England.

Mary Cole's *The Lady's Complete Guide* includes a note on the title page telling readers that it contains receipts from "every reputable English Book of Cookery," yet contains twenty recipes with regional identifiers, putting her cookbook in the top three of a list for having the most regional recipes. These include five recipes from Scotland, two from Wales, and the rest from various English counties and cities, including two that just say "English" without a more specific identifier. Yet even though her recipes indicate the importance she placed on distinguishing cuisine from different parts of Great Britain, she lumps them all under the phrase "English Cookery."[28]

Collingwood and Woollams worked for many years in two of London's taverns, the London Tavern and the Crown and Anchor, and their cookbook is filled with regional recipes, as well as foreign ones outside of French cuisine. Their book represents the commercial and varied nature of the British Empire with recipes from all over the world, both imperial holdings and other nations that Britain had contact with. Although recipes like "Portugal Beef" and "Westphalia Bacon" are present in nearly all the books, *The Universal Cook* goes even further to include things like "Macedonian Ducks" and "To dress a Turtle the West India Way." These particular recipes are extremely rare in published cookbooks of the period. In addition to the recipes reflecting the exotic

[28] Mary Cole, *The Lady's Complete Guide; or Cookery in All Its Branches* (London, 1788).

influences available in London, it also includes several British recipes like "A Cheshire Pork Pie," "Scotch Barley Broth," and "A Yorkshire Pudding," representing the nostalgic desire for recipes that represented specific regions within Great Britain itself.[29]

Eliza Melroe's *An Economical and New Method of Cookery* was set up differently than most published cookbooks from this period.[30] Instead of a comprehensive list of recipe after recipe, Melroe instead decided to make each chapter a commentary on particular categories of food. These chapters include specific recipes but are mostly discussions of the availability of ingredients and specific recipes in various parts of the kingdom. Her emphasis is on the different English counties, but also includes some discussion on Scotland and Ireland as well. For example, the chapter on barley first discusses the types of barley available in Great Britain, then lists Melroe's preferred type of barley to use, and finally lists several different ways to prepare it. Her preference is "pot-barley, commonly called Scotch-barley which every house-keeper ought to use." Melroe's language throughout the book does not necessarily suggest that she is partial to one region of Great Britain and its offerings. Instead, she takes a very methodical approach to listing the differences in regional preferences. Some examples of this are "hashed liver is a dish much used in some counties," "those born and bred in [Staffordshire] are bound by a singular custom where they roast meat they never eat," and "in Northumberland and counties adjacent [roast] beef is seldom or never ate

[29] Francis Collingwood and John Woollams, *The Universal Cook and City and Country Housekeeper* (London, 1792).
[30] Eliza Melroe, *An Economical and New Method of Cookery: Describing Upwards of Eighty Cheap, Wholesome, and Nourishing Dishes* (London, 1798).

untaken with salt."[31] Because recipes are not listed in the traditional way, with title and then instructions, it is impossible to quantify how many can be considered "British" titles. However, her propensity to list the regional preferences for preparing each category of food further supports the argument that by the end of the eighteenth century regional uniqueness was just as important to Britons as a common national identity.

One book studied for this project was published in Dublin but was quite clearly marketed toward an English audience. This is *The London Art of Cookery* by John Farley.[32] Without statistics on the costs of printing in various places, there is no way to know the exact reason that why Farley would have had his cookbook printed in Dublin. However, it is logical to assume that the place of printing was also the first market for the cookbooks. Therefore, it is very interesting and slightly suspect that an author who was promoting "London" cuisine would choose to print the book in Ireland. Even more curious is the fact that Farley's book was produced eighteen years before the 1801 Act of Union. Although the Act of Union was the specific piece of legislation connecting Ireland to Britain, the relationship between the two didn't start there. In fact, Ireland and England had shared a monarch since 1542. So, while it would not have been difficult for an Englishman to publish a cookbook in Ireland, it is significant that the title refers to the "London Art of Cookery" rather than the "Dublin Art of Cookery." Furthermore, Farley's book contains seventeen regional recipes, three of which are "English," two are "Scottish," and the rest are attributed to various other parts of England. Not a single recipe is attributed to Ireland even with Dublin as the publishing city. Whether or not the

[31] Melroe, *An Economical and New Method of Cooking,* 21, 26, 28.
[32] Raffald, *The Experience English House-keeper*; Farley, *The London Art of Cookery*.

majority of the cookbooks were used in Ireland, we can be sure that at least some of them stayed in Ireland and were used by Irish families. Promoting a cuisine from London, and more specifically including several English recipes, in Ireland is evidence of the tendency for Englishmen to support "English" as the primary cultural identifier of Great Britain. His significant lack of many Scottish recipes or any Welsh recipes is even more illustrative of this fact.

Regional Identifiers in Recipe Titles

Not every author explicitly displayed varying cultural references through an introduction. It would have been prudent for some authors to appear neutral in order to sell more copies of the book. Because of this, it is necessary to look also at recipe titles to determine whether or not authors promoted a uniform national identity or whether they believed in celebrating cultural distinctions between British regions. It is also in the recipe titles that we can see how nostalgia functioned in the world of food. With a decreasing emphasis on rural life and places like London being an economic center of Britain, people from all over the kingdom often moved to the urban centers in order to find work or start new business enterprises. The taverns operated as opportunities for social and economic connections serving as meeting places, inns, and restaurants for people of all classes in London. The authors whose experience was built on their years working as tavern cooks capitalized on this, including recipes from all parts of Britain as well as foreign food.

Successful merchant families who were upwardly mobile in London's social hierarchy were continually looking for opportunities to celebrate both their foreign

economic connections and their regional and national loyalties. "Armchair nostalgia" was expressed through the use of recipes and ingredients from the colonies and traditional nostalgia through the use of recipes that celebrated Britain's culturally distinctive components. Alexander Hunter's discussion of Indian curry is an excellent example of this. His notes on the various curry recipes repeatedly mention the propensity of British people to eat curry and "even those who have not been in that country, contract a liking for curries."[33]

For the majority of the cookbooks, the sections on roasting and boiling meat did not deviate from the most basic directions on preparing meat for a dinner. The recipe titles were simple, "To stew beef," "Lobster roasted" or "Sweet-breads roasted." Occasionally an author would add "in the French way" or "in the Dutch way," telling us that in general, preparing meat was done in a traditional British way. The added national identifier could indicate a more complex preparation or the use of more ingredients, rather than a plainly roasted meat without a sauce or other additions. Rarely did the author feel the need to add a regional identifier to the basic preparation of meat. Therefore it is the recipes that eighteenth and nineteenth century authors called "Made Dishes" that we are able to see distinctions. This category of recipe encompassed everything from main entrées to desserts and occasionally included a recipe for preparing meat that was considered more extravagant than a basic roast.

In 1816, Maria Rundell published *A New System of Domestic Cookery* whose introduction warned against living above your means. Her instructions are directed

[33] Alexander Hunter, *Culina Famulatrix Medicina* (York, 1806), 167.

towards what she calls families of the "middle line," repeatedly telling her audience to live as they can afford and not to "emulate the entertainments of the higher classes."[34] Her recipes are reflective of the middle class families for which she writes and the nostalgia that these people were experiencing. The publication date of 1816 is significant as it represents the period after the end of the Napoleonic Wars. As Stuart Semmel tells us, the anti-French fervor of wartime Britain died down drastically after the defeat of Napoleon. Many Britons were initially happy to see a French monarch reinstated and focused back on cultural distinctions within Britain, reverting back to the traditional values of the nation's various regions.[35] Rundell's cookbook is very representative of the importance of regional distinctions after 1816, with thirty eight different recipes from all over Britain, including Scotland, Ireland, Wales, London, Devonshire, Yorkshire, and at least five other English counties, as well as five recipes attributed to English cities. She wasn't the first, nor the last, to celebrate regional distinctions but out of the cookbook sample analyzed in this thesis, Rundell's book definitely had the most regionally distinctive recipes with thirty eight. Her book contains the typical recipes like "Scotch Collops," and "Shrewsbury Cakes" which are found in many other cookbooks published at various points between 1750 and 1850.[36] In addition, Rundell includes regional

[34] Mara Eliza Ketelby Rundell, *A New System of Domestic Cookery; formed upon the Principles of Economy and adapted to the Use of Private Families* (London, 1816), ii; v.
[35]Stuart Semmel, *Napoleon and the British* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), 40
[36] Rundell, *A New System of Domestic Cookery,* 52; 238. Of the 23 cookbooks, over half include a recipe for Scotch Collops and 11 include a recipe for Shrewsbury Cakes.

recipes that are entirely new, or were listed very rarely previously, like "Irish Pancakes," "Scotch eggs," "Welch ale," and "Staffordshire syllabub."[37]

As mentioned before, there were several other authors who recognized the importance of distinct regional recipes. Hannah Glasse in 1747 listed nineteen different recipes from various British regions. There were no Irish recipes since Ireland was not yet an official part of the kingdom. Seven Scottish recipes were listed which is significant since this book was published only two years after the '45 rebellion. In fact, out of any cookbook that did include Scottish recipes, Glasse listed the most which supports the need for public opinion to desire clear distinctions between Scottish and English even though the rebellion resulted in the English government wanting a suppression of Scottish culture. Her Scottish recipes include "To make a Scotch rabbit" which is listed with "To make an English rabbit" and "To make a Welch rabbit." The "rabbit" recipe in this case is closer to what we would currently call a grilled cheese sandwich. It is a very simple recipe with few ingredients but Glasse does find it necessary to list three variations attributed to the three different components of Great Britain that existed at that time.

For Charlotte Mason, in *The Lady's Assistant,* it is specifically the recipes for puddings and cakes that show the most regional distinction. Overall her cookbook has sixteen recipes with regional identifiers and of these nine are a pudding, cake, or pie recipe. She includes two recipes that are attributed to different Dukes in England, the Duke of Buckingham and the Duke of Cumberland. The book also includes a recipe

[37] Rundell, *A New System of Domestic Cookery,* 152; 207; 247; 202. Of these recipes listed, only Irish Pancakes were found elsewhere, in Cleland, *A New And Easy Method of Cookery*, 127.

called "Cumberland Pudding" which is different than "The Duke of Cumberland's Pudding."[38]

It is common knowledge in the world of published cookery books that authors often reprinted recipes that had been published previously by others. The decision of whether or not to include regionally specific recipes was still up to the compiler since they had the option to generalize the old recipes or change titles even without changing the process or the ingredients. Mary Cole had no qualms in telling her readers that the recipes in her book were not original. In fact, she listed several well known authors when discussing where she got the recipes including Glasse, Mason, Verral, and Raffald.[39] Her book includes twenty recipes with regional identifiers, only two of which include the word "English," even though her introduction indicates that her book covers only "English cookery." Her penchant for using "English" to describe all of Great Britain is clearly in line with many other authors, but the sheer number of regional recipes indicates that Cole still recognized the importance of the cultural distinctions between the different parts of Britain.

John Perkins in 1796 was sure to distinguish between the "metropolis," London, and "the kingdom," the rest of Great Britain. Like Sarah Harrison, he discussed the difficultly of the "remote parts of the kingdom" to have access to either good ingredients or good cuisine in general.[40] His introduction never uses specific terms like "English" or "British," only ever referring to the tastes and appetites of "the kingdom." This is

[38] Charlotte Mason, *The Lady's Assistant for Regulating and Supplying Her Table* (London, 1773), 281; 287. Interesting to note that in the 1777 edition published in Dublin, several recipes include the additional title "the New England Way." In the first edition there are no recipes with this addition.
[39] Cole, *The Lady's Complete Guide,* i.
[40] John Perkins, *Every Woman Her Own House Keeper; or, The Ladies' Library* (London, 1796), viii.

significant, especially since his cookbook has thirty different regional recipes, second only to Maria Rundell in 1816. Even though Perkins published in England his book lacks the conflation of "English" and "British." This, combined with the inclusion of so many regionally distinctive recipes, tells us that not all Britons equated English and British. Although we do not know where Perkins was originally from, we can at least infer that he did not rely on a belief of English superiority when he published his cookbook.

Other authors who have a significant number of regional recipes include Elizabeth Raffald with eleven, Elizabeth Cleland with fifteen, and John Farley with seventeen. The lowest number of regional recipes is found in Martha Bradley's cookbook. Bradley only had two, "making English Wines" and "Scots Collops."[41] Some version of "Scotch collops" appears in almost every cookbook, so Bradley's inclusion of the recipe is very typical. According to the *Oxford Companion to Food*, collop was originally defined as "a rasher of salt bacon, to be fried, often with eggs…" Later, the term came to have the more "general meaning of a slice of meat." Overall, "Scotch collops were a well-known dish from the 17th to the 19th centuries, although the manner of preparing them changed over time."[42] What is unique about Bradley's version is that she only lists a single collop recipe. Most authors had at least two, "Scotch Collops white" and "Scotch Collops brown," and many included other variations such as "Scotch Collops Larded" or "Scotch Collops in the French way."[43]

[41] Bradley, *The British Housewife,* 52; 80.
[42] Davidson, *Oxford Companion to Food*, 204.
[43] Of the authors who have a version of Scotch Collops, sixteen total, five list only a basic recipe without any variation.

Because cookbooks during this period often included copying recipes from previously published books, analyzing ingredient names is a good way to understand how national or regional pride could be expressed. "Salmagundi," for instance, is a recipe that was included in several different books. The recipe itself was a popular type of salad that was served with dinners up to the nineteenth century as it was made up of whatever you could find in the kitchen. It generally included either pickled herring or anchovies and most authors simply listed one or the other. Two authors, however, specify "British" herring in their recipes for Salmagundi, possibly an expression of national pride. The recipe itself was often accompanied by a note from the author encouraging readers to modify the ingredient list based on what they already had on hand. Hannah Glasse in 1747 tells her readers that "you may always make [it] of such things as you have, according to your Fancy" and E. Taylor in 1769 offers readers a choice between using pickled herring or anchovies, "which you please."[44] Out of ten cookbooks that included a recipe for Salmagundi, two of them specified that cooks should use British herring, Eliza Smith in 1742 and Charlotte Mason in 1773.[45] The inclusion of the term "British" as an identifier of a specific herring could have been an expression of patriotism and trust in Great Britain. Authors often spoke of where to find the best provisions for recipes, including items like anchovies and herring. Martha Bradley wrote that anchovies were caught off the coasts of Provence and Catalonia, and Charlotte Mason said that herrings

[44] E. Taylor, *Lady's, Housewife's and Cookmaid's Assistant; or, the Art of Cookery* (Berwick upon Tweed, 1769), ii and 54.; Glasse, *The Art of Cookery*, 60.
[45] E. Smith, *The Compleat Housewife* (London, 1742); Mason, *The Lady's Assistant*, 234. Other authors who included a recipe for Salmagundi, but didn't specify "British herrings," include Harrison-1773, Glasse-1747, Thacker-1758, Taylor-1769, Raffald-1769, Farley-1783, and Rundell-1816.

were best when caught in the North Sea.[46] As the North Sea is located between Great Britain, Scandinavia, Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium and France, identifying herring as "British" probably indicated that Smith and Mason expected their readers to only use herring caught by British fisherman.

Subscriber Publishing

Subscriber publishing was a way for authors to guarantee a revenue before going through the work of publishing and can help us understand the primary reach of a published cookbook. Similar to the work of publishing now, there was no assurance that an author would be able to make a living off of the sales of the books that were published. Getting groups of subscribers beforehand was a way to ensure that the book would at least make some money after the cost of printing. The use of subscriptions was relatively common in the eighteenth century within many genres of published works but that didn't necessarily mean that every author employed this method. Within the sample of cookbooks used in this project, only three authors included a subscriber list as proof of utilizing the subscriber publishing method. These were Hannah Glasse's *The Art of Cookery,* E. Taylor's *Lady's, Housewife's, and Cookmaid's Assistant*, and Sarah Martin's *The New Experienced English-Housekeeper*. This method was used to secure funding for the first edition of the book as authors hoped to find publishers willing to put up the cost of the printing after the book proved a success.[47] Subscription publishing, in fact, was one of the few things that England exported to France when it came to cuisine.

[46] Bradley, *The British Housewife,* 6; Mason, *The Lady's Assistant*, 213.
[47] Anne Willan, et.al., *The Cookbook Library: Four Centuries of the Cooks, Writers, and Recipes that Made the Modern Cookbook* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012), 216.

French authors called the method *la maniere d'Angleterre*, or "the manner of England" indicating that this type of publishing originated in England.[48] Glasse had a subscriber list in the first edition of *The Art of Cookery* but none of her subsequent 11 editions included this list.

Not every published cookbook included a subscriber list but for those that did, the lists are useful in determining the initial audience the author was writing for. The subscriber lists represents a group of people who paid for a copy of the book before it was published and were often responsible for passing the book along to friends and family. In order to please these subscribers, the author would need to ensure that the book was something that their subscribers wanted to read. So, it stands to reason what the subscribers were most interested in could affect the content of the book. Each list is comprised of people who lived near the area that the book was published and each book was published in a different place. *The Art of Cookery* was published in London in 1747 and Glasse's subscribers were made up of people primarily from the City. With London being a cultural hub for Great Britain Glasse's inclusion of several French recipes as well as several British ones is understandable. London would have been where middle class families were most concerned about following the current fashions, including a dependence on *nouvelle cuisine.* However, London also attracted people from all over Great Britain suggesting that Glasse's readers would have also been interested in using recipes from the various British regions.

[48] Willan, *The Cookbook Library*, 210.

Taylor's book was published in Berwick-Upon-Tweed, a small town about two and a half miles south of the Scottish border in the county of Northumberland. The majority of her subscribers came from four places: Berwick, Edinburgh, Alnwick, and Morpeth. Aside from Edinburgh, all of these places are located in Northumberland. Out of the 49 other places that her subscribers were listed to be from, all but two were also located in Northumberland. Taylor's cookbook as a whole is not extraordinary. In fact, her recipes are very basic instructions on boiling, roasting, stewing, etc. with a very small section on made-dishes. Even the made-dishes are listed with simple titles without any kind of national or regional marker attached to them. There are ten exceptions to this reality, half of which are given a Scottish identifier and the other half are given identifiers associated with either France or an English county. Given that the first copies of this cookbook to be published were to end up either in Scotland or Northumberland this should not surprise us, especially since Northumberland is one of the closest counties to Scotland. It stands to reason that this county would have had a strong influence from Scotland on their culinary preferences. As Linda Colley writes, "Northumberland was much closer to being a Scottish than an English county."[49] The cultural exchange between the two was much higher than between anyone in Northumberland and London, and Northumbrians most often identified with Scots than anyone else in England.

Sarah Martin's *The New Experienced English Housekeeper* seemed to be directed only toward an audience living in England, since her title specifies "English"

[49] Colley, *Britons,* 16.

housekeeper rather than a more general audience in all of Great Britain. However, her subscriber list included people from Edinburgh, telling us that copies of this book were used outside of England alone. She also had quite a few subscribers in Northumberland whose residents, as we discussed before, was often considered more akin to Scotland than England. Overall, the variety of places that her book was sent, including Yorkshire, Lincolnshire, Nottinghamshire, and Cheshire, among others, is shocking considering the few regionally distinctive recipes included in her book.[50] In the end, however, Martin's book only had two editions suggesting that its popularity was low. This could have been attributed to her lack of importance placed on regional distinctions leading to poor word of mouth from her original subscribers. Of course, without further information on the consumption statistics of the book, the lack of editions could also be attributed to a myriad of other things. The publication history of John Farley's cookbook, discussed earlier, presents a similar problem since it was printed in Dublin but marketed toward an English audience. Martin's subscriber list allows us to understand how even though the book was destined for places all over Great Britain, the author framed the content in a way that suggested everyone who used her book was looking to emulate an "English Housekeeper." It is further evidence for the conflation of "English" and "British" during this period, just as Farley's *London Art of Cookery* supported this fact.

Great Britain encompassed several culturally distinct regions during the period between 1750 and 1850. Although Anglo-French conflict was pushing the people living

[50] Without specific consumption statistics of the cookbooks, we really have no way of determining where the books were most widely read. If we assume that the subscribers were the initial market, and therefore the most important considering the significance placed on word-of-mouth to sell products, then it is surprising that Martin would have such a lack of recipes that would appeal to a wide audience.

in these regions toward a common identity as "British," regional uniqueness never lost its importance. From Sarah Harrison's cookbook published in 1733, which had six regionally specific recipes, to Maria Rundell's in 1816, which had thirty eight recipes specific to different British regions, the trend is clear. By the time the Napoleonic Wars had ended, French food was no longer the primary form of cuisine served in fashionable and elite households. At the same time however, an all-encompassing "British" cuisine still did not exist within Great Britain. Instead, people still felt that it was important to make regional distinctions, printing and using recipes that reminded them of all of the diverse areas of the kingdom. Although Linda Colley's argument that Anglo-French conflict assisted in creating a new "British" identity, it is clear that patriotism did not supersede regional preferences. As the concept of national loyalty was gaining ground in Great Britain among the population as a whole, regional loyalty was still a very large part of creating and expressing personal identity.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

To say identity is complicated is an understatement. On an individual level, one's personal history as well as the world around you contributes to how you view yourself. At the same time, an individual's identity is not just about how you see yourself. Instead, it contains elements of how you appear to outsiders as well. But identity can also be applied to groups of people who fall within specific cultural, social, economic, or political categories. For these groups identity is comprised of what each individual has in common as well as what sets them apart from other groups of people. Even explaining what defines identity becomes complicated as you are forced to take into account too many factors to keep track of. As seen in this thesis, there are three kinds of identity that often work together and oppose each other when defining both an individual's view of themselves as well as how that individual fits into a larger group of people. For the people living in Great Britain between 1750 and 1850, forming an "identity" meant grappling with how personal experience was intertwined with politics, economics, and culture.

Defining the identity of a group of people like the Britons is especially difficult when the people themselves do not always identify with one another. As historians, we are forced to make generalizations while arguing a point, categorizing everyone who lived within Great Britain as "Britons" even if people from various regions rarely viewed themselves that way. Geography seems to be the only real thing that linked all the people

of Great Britain yet this is enough to necessitate the creation of a group identity. Political enmity toward the French was something else that Britons had in common, tying them together and helping them to create an identity that we can call "British." Linda Colley's book *Britons: Forging the Nation* certainly seems to suggest that by the end of the eighteenth century the people of Great Britain were well on their way to identifying with one another as "British." Through the use of an unorthodox source, commercially published cookbooks produced between 1750 and 1850, we are able to see that this was not always the case. There are exceptions to every rule and although Britons *for the most part* disliked the French, there were still many who had a very positive view of France. As chapter one highlighted, men who trained professionally with masters of French cuisine wrote glowing reviews of French food and cooks, seemingly disregarding the years of tension between Britain and France.

Published cookbooks started out as exchanges of culinary innovation between professionally trained male cooks. Observing how cookbooks evolved over time into a manual of instruction for amateur cooks and housekeepers reveals a gendered perspective. Gender norms and stereotypes in eighteenth and nineteenth century Britain dictated what spheres that men and women were allowed to operate in, based on societal definitions of morality and what was "right." In the world of cuisine, men were allowed to approach cuisine from a professional stance and were historically the inventors and innovators of food. The original male cookbook authors coming out of France in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were food artists. On the other hand, women could only approach cuisine through the lens of the private sphere. Relegated to the household

due to feminine stereotypes in Great Britain, the women who wanted to establish a professional presence as a cookbook author framed their books within these stereotypes. Drawing on experience as wives, mothers, and housekeepers, female cookbook authors sold themselves as experts in all matters of the household, not just as cooks. Cooking offered women an opportunity to venture into the world of professionals, a realm supposedly dominated by men, yet food also kept women within the stereotype of the home. Although the professional world of food may have originally been created by men, little by little they were pushed out as women became prominent authors.

As evidenced by authors William Kitchiner and Alexander Hunter, men who attempted to remain in the world of published cookbooks chose to market the books as medical treatises. The medical profession was something that still excluded women, and offered a niche for men to reclaim their place in the world of food. They also represented the re-emergence of cooking as a science rather than an art, a genre that had lost popularity with the advent of *nouvelle cuisine*. By modifying the genre of cookery books to include a focus on the health advantages of certain foods, men reestablished a place for themselves in the culinary world. Experience in the world of medicine set them apart from women, allowing them to market a separate category of cookery books and compete with the books based on experience in a household. As the included appendix shows, *The Cook's Oracle* by William Kitchiner went through at least seven editions. But even more remarkable was that his book was frequently published in places outside of Great Britain, including New York and Boston. Kitchiner was able to rebrand his cookbook as an American book in order to create popularity in the United States. The

book's information was based on his medical expertise and scientific experimentation with different recipes, apparently making it desirable enough by the average consumer to go through more editions than previously male-authored cookery books.

The variations in how authors identified their audiences reveals the different levels of social classes that existed in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Although we can generalize by saying that published cookbooks were written for the benefit of the "middling class," the authors' introductions show us how many different levels existed within the "middle." Writers were simultaneously trying to appeal to women who worked as housekeepers, the women who employed them, and women who didn't have enough money to employ anyone at all. Each group required the information necessary to run a household, whether they were giving instruction or taking it. Starting in the eighteenth century published cookbooks were designed to help the ignorant. Although early cookbooks like Sarah Harrison's in 1733 lacked explicit instructions for basic tasks, the structure of cookbooks evolved to assist those without any knowledge of the kitchen or household. These books were marketed towards many types of women in Great Britain and their introductions reveal the complexity of defining the social station of the middling class. Qualities like elegance and frugality were simultaneously expressed, revealing a desire to portray sophistication without being required to spend a lot of money.

Once we understand the audience of published cookbooks, it becomes easier to try and get at how the audience viewed themselves. In other words, we are able to find evidence of shared and individual identities that were being developed in Great Britain

between 1750 and 1850. The merging of England with Wales, Scotland, and Ireland created a supposedly "united" kingdom but each region retained distinct qualities. Although Francophobia assisted in the establishment of a national identity that seemed to unite people of all four components, regional loyalties were still just as important in the discovery of personal identity. Linda Colley argues that by the end of the Napoleonic Wars the peoples of Great Britain had come together to fight the French and through their patriotism had successfully created an identity that was "British." What the cookbooks show us is that in addition to national patriotism that was dependent on the French as "the other," regional distinctions maintained importance among Britons. French cuisine was losing importance in the published cookbooks of Britain as French recipes lost their exotic natures and foreignness became associated with extravagance while regional references became more frequent.

Analyzing the chronology of cookbooks allows us to understand how political events shaped both national and regional identity. Cookbooks also reveal the complexity of social hierarchies during this period. Studies of consumption, including those related to food, tend to focus on two components: systems that create mass consumption and the attitudes and values of the people that result in a consumer culture.[1] Cuisine is a way to understand how food reflects both of these components, as political and economic factors affect a system of mass consumption as well as the values that found the basis of a consumer culture. An expression of power, wealth, and sophistication through the use of food is something that is accepted by most historians. Since all of these characteristics

[1] For more information about the sociological theories on consumption see Sharon Zukin and Jennifer Smith Maguire, "Consumers and Consumption," *Annual Review of Sociology,* 30 (2004), 175.

contribute to an individual's identity, it makes sense that food could also express national and regional aspects of how a person views themselves as well. Both the introductions and recipes included in cookbooks give us clues as to how political events affected the development of an identity based on national loyalty or cultural distinctions. Wars against an old enemy, like France, motivated people to band together and express loyalty to their nation. Many Irish and Scottish soldiers participated in the Napoleonic Wars alongside English and Welsh soldiers. They all fought for the same cause, British victory over the French, and for a time were able to set aside cultural differences.[2] Published cookbooks reflect this unification and expression of "British" identity but they also tell us how important cultural distinctions were between the various components that made up Great Britain. Recipes specific to Scotland, Ireland, Wales, and the various English counties remind us that national identity did not always take priority for people living in Great Britain. The establishment as the French as "the other" helped create a common enemy for Britons and an identity that was founded on anti-French sentiments. However when war was over and tensions between Britain and France were less prominent, being "anti-French" lost importance as expressing regional distinctions gained significance.

There are many other potential uses for cookbooks as primary sources for historical research. Questions of the place of women in professionalization and the complications of gender stereotypes in regard to food are obvious as we read through published cookbooks. Going further with an analysis of the place of men and women in

[2] Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707-1837* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), 285.

the culinary world would answer queries about the evolution of gender identities during other time periods, such as the height of the Victorian period or the early twentieth century. The kitchen has historically been a place to understand how women push against gender boundaries but cookbooks reveal a complicated sense of masculinity as well. The tendency of men to rely on different types of training and background as proof of their expertise in the culinary arts is evidence of a need to confirm differences in gender identities.

A more complete analysis of how specific recipes changed from cookbook to cookbook could support an argument about the availability of ingredients in Great Britain. This would in turn allow historians to answer questions about how closely connected people in the British Isles were to other parts of the British Empire. A project like this would require a close comparison of recipes between different authors and between multiple editions of the same cookbook. An analysis of how often ingredients like "Jamaica Pepper" were used or when cayenne pepper became prominent would help us map out when people in places like England or Scotland were able to get exotic spices easiest. Combining this with a look at contemporary newspapers would be very useful, specifically looking at articles related to shipments of these spices over large distances. For example, a newspaper article from the Whitehall Evening Post on March 12, 1785 tells us a story of the robbery of forty-nine bags of Jamaica pepper from a ship in the harbor.[3] Since thieves steal what is valuable, this article suggests that the market for Jamaica pepper was high in 1785 and the thieves would have expected to sell it quickly

[3] "Commitments and Robberies," *Whitehall Evening Post,* March 12, 1785, 3.

and at a good price. An article in the November 20, 1792 issue of *The World* tells us the items available by a certain seller in London, including "Genuine Cayenne Pepper."[4] Combining this article with an analysis of how often Jamaica pepper or cayenne pepper appears in recipes around this time would give us a better idea of how popular the spices were at the end of the eighteenth century.

The genre of cookery books has been a popular one since the first published books were printed which means that they are a potential source for any time period and nearly every part of the world. Comparative work could be done with British cookbooks versus those published in other places like France or the United States. Comparing the types of cuisine that are popular in different places would help us understand how far of a cultural reach some nations have. Does Indian food have as much popularity in France or the United States or is it solely popular in Britain because of their imperial ties? Looking at recipes for curries would support an argument about how closely connected various nations were to India. Learning how culinary trends spread between nations is important because it helps us understand the cultural exchange that existed during periods of high or low imperial activity. Through these kinds of analysis we can find clues about the importance of empire in shaping national identity.

[4] "Burgess's Italian Warehouse," *The World,* November 20, 1792, 3.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Abbot, Robert. *The Housekeeper's Valuable Present: or, Lady's Closet Companion.* London, 1790.

Bradley, Martha. *The British Housewife: or, the Cook, Housekeeper's and Gardiner's Companion.* London, 1760.

"Burgess's Italian Warehouse." *The World,* November 20, 1792.

Cleland, Elizabeth. *A New and Easy Method of Cookery.* Edinburgh, 1755.

"Commitments and Robberies." *Whitehall Evening Post,* March 12, 1785.

Clermont, B. *The Professed Cook: or, the Modern Art of Cookery, Pastry, and Confectionary, Made Plain and Easy.* London, 1769 (2nd Edition).

Cole, Mary. *The Lady's Complete Guide; or Cookery in All its Branches.* London, 1788.

Collingwood, Francis and John Woollams. *The Universal Cook, and City and Country Housekeeper.* London, 1792.

Farley, John. *The London Art of Cookery and Housekeeper's Complete Assistant.* London, 1783.

Frazer, Mrs. *The Practice of Cookery, Pastry, Pickling, Preserving, &c.* Edinburgh, 1791.

Glasse, Hannah. *The Art of Cookery, Made Plain and Easy.* London, 1747.

Harrison, Sarah. *The House-Keeper's Pocket-Book, and Compleat Family Cook.* London, 1733.

Henderson, William Augustus. *The Housekeeper's Instructor; or, Universal Family Cook*. London, 1790.

Hunter, Alexander. *Culina Famulatrix Medicinia; or Receipts in Modern Cookery.* York, 1806.

Johnson, Mary. *The Young Woman's Companion.* London, 1753.

Kitchiner, William. *Apicius Redivivus; or, The Cook's Oracle.* London, 1817.

Martin, Sarah. *The New Experienced English-Housekeeper, for the Use and Ease of Ladies, Housekeepers, Cooks, &c.* Doncaster, 1795.

Mason, Charlotte. *The Lady's Assistant for Regulating and Supplying her Table, Being a Complete System of Cookery.* Compiled by Richard Burton. Dublin, 1777 (3rd Edition).

May, Robert. *The Accomplisht Cook, or the Art and Mystery of Cookery.* London, 1665.

Melroe, Eliza. *An Economical, and New Method of Cookery.* London, 1798.

Perkins, John. *Every Woman Her Own House Keeper; or, The Ladies' Library.* London, 1796 (4th Edition).

Raffald, Elizabeth. *The Experienced English House-keeper, for the Use and Ease of Ladies, House-keepers, Cooks, &c.* Manchester, 1769.

Rundell, Maria. *A New System of Domestic Cookery; Formed upon Principles of Economy.* London, 1816.

Smith, E. *The Compleat Housewife: or Accomplish'd Gentlewoman's Companion*. London, 1742. (11th Edition)

Taylor, E. *The Lady's, Housewife's, and Cookmaid's Assistant: or, the Art of Cookery*. Berwick upon Tweed, 1769.

Taylor, Margaret. *Mrs. Taylor's Family Companion; or the Whole Art of Cookery Display'd.* London, 1795.

Thacker, John. *The Art of Cookery.* Newcastle upon Tyne, 1758.

Verral, William. *A Complete System of Cookery.* London, 1759.

Secondary Sources

"Act of Proscription." Education Scotland, accessed February 19, 2014. http://www.educationscotland.gov.uk/scotlandshistory/jacobitesenlightenmentclearances/actofproscription/index.asp.

Albala, Ken. *Food in Early Modern Europe*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 2003.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism.* New York: Verso, 2006.

Appadurai, Arjun. "How to Make a National Cuisine: Cookbooks in Contemporary India." *Comparative Studies in Society and History.* Vol. 30, No. 1 (Jan., 1988), pp. 3-24.

Ayrton, Elisabeth. *The Cookery of England.* New York: Penguin, 1988.

Berg, Maxine. "From Imitation to Invention: Creating Commodities in Eighteenth-Century Britain." *The Economic History Review*. Vol. 55, No. 1 (Feb., 2002), pp 1-30.

Berg, Maxine. "In Pursuit of Luxury: Global History and British Consumer Goods in the Eighteenth Century." *Past & Present.* No. 182 (Feb., 2004), pp. 85-142.

Berg, Maxine. "Women's Consumption and the Industrial Classes of Eighteenth-Century England." *Journal of Social History*. Vol. 30, No. 2 (Winter, 1996), pp. 415-434.

Berg, Maxine. *Luxury and Pleasure in Eighteenth-Century Britain*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Berry, Helen. "Polite Consumption: Shopping in Eighteenth-Century England." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*. Vol. 12 (2002), pp. 375-394.

Bickham, Troy. "Eating the Empire: Intersections of Food, Cookery and Imperialism in Eighteenth-Century Britain." *Past and Present*. Vol. 198 (Feb., 2008), pp. 71-109.

Black, Jeremy. *The British and the Grand Tour.* Dover: Croom Helm, 1985.

Brewer, John and Roy Porter. Ed. *Consumption and the World of Goods.* New York: Routledge, 1993.

Burton, Antoinette. *Burdens of History: British Feminists, Indian Women and Imperial Culture 1865-1915*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994.

Church, Roy. "Advertising Consumer Goods in Nineteenth-Century Britain: Reinterpretations." *The Economic History Review.* Vol. 53, No. 4 (Nov., 2000), pp. 621-645.

Colley, Linda. *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707-1837.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.

Collingham, Lizzie. *Curry: A Tale of Cooks & Conquerors.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Colquhoun, Kate. *Taste: The Story of Britain Through Its Cooking*. New York: Bloomsbury, 2007.

Crowston, Clare. "Women, Gender, and Guilds in Early Modern Europe: An Overview of Recent Research." *IRSH*. Vol. 53, Supplement (2008), pp. 19-44.

Davidson, Alan, ed. *The Oxford Companion to Food*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.

de la Falaise, Maxime. *Seven Centuries of English Cooking: A Collection of Recipes.* Edited by Arabella Boxer, New York: Grove Press, 1973.

Ferguson, Priscilla. "Eating Orders: Markets, Menus, and Meals." *The Journal of Modern History,* Vol. 77, No. 3 (September, 2005). pp. 679-700

Fernandez-Armesto, Felipe. *Near a Thousand Tables: A History of Food.* New York: Free Press, 2002.

Girouard, Mark. *Life in the English Country House: A Social and Architectural History.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978.

Glaisyer, Natasha. "Networking: Trade and Exchange in the Eighteenth-Century British Empire." *The Historical Journal*. Vol. 47, No. 2 (Jun., 2004), pp. 451-476.

Hall, Catherine. *Civilizing Subjects: Metropole and Colony in the English Imagination, 1830-1867.* Chicago, 2002.

Higgins, Padhraig. "Consumption, Gender, and the Politics of 'Free Trade' in Eighteenth-Century Ireland." *Eighteenth-Century Studies.* Vol. 41, No. 1 (Fall, 2007), pp. 87-105.

Holtzman, Jon. "Food and Memory," *Annual Review of Anthropology*. Vol 35 (2006), pp. 361-378.

Jacobs, Edward H. "Buying into Classes: The Practice of Book Selection in Eighteenth-Century Britain." *Eighteenth-Century Studies.* Vol. 33, No. 1 (Fall, 1999), pp. 43-64.

Judd, Denis. *Empire: The British Imperial Experience from 1765 to the Present.* New York: Harper Collins, 1996.

Kurlansky, Mark. *Salt: A World History.* New York: Penguin Books, 2002.

Kidd, Colin. "North Britishness and the Nature of Eighteenth-Century British Patriotism." *The Historical Journal*. Vol. 39, No. 2 (Jun., 1996), pp. 361-382.

Klein, Lawrence E. "Politeness and the Interpretation of the British Eighteenth Century." *The Historical Journal*. Vol. 45, No. 4 (Dec., 2002), pp. 869-898.

Langford, Paul. *A Polite and Commercial People: England 1727-1783.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.

Lehmann, Gilly. *The British Housewife: Cookery Books, Cooking and Society in Eighteenth-Century Britain.* Westport: Greenwood Press, 1999.

Levi-Strauss, Claude. *The Origin of Table Manners.* New York: Harper, 1978.

Mennel, Stephen. *All Manners of Food: Eating and Taste in England and France from the Middle Ages to the Present.* Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 1995.

Mintz, Sidney W. *Sweetness and Power: The Place of Sugar in Modern History.* New York: Penguin, 1985.

Miur, Rory. *Britain and the Defeat of Napoleon, 1807-1815.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996.

Olsen, Kirstin. *Daily Life in 18th Century England.* Westport: Greenwood Press, 1999.

Peterson, T. Sarah. *Acquired Taste: The French Origins of Modern Cooking.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994.

Pincus, Steve. "Rethinking Mercantilism: Political Economy, the British Empire, and the Atlantic World in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries." *The William and Mary Quarterly.* Vol. 69, No. 1 (Jan., 2012), pp. 3-34.

Richardson, Gary. "A Tale of Two Theories: Monopolies and Craft Guilds in Medeival England and Modern Imagination." *Journal of the History of Economic Thought.* Vol. 23, No. 2 (2001), pp 217-242.

Semmel, Stuart. *Napoleon and the British.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004.

Smith Maguire, Jennifer and Sharon Zukin. "Consumers and Consumption." *Annual Review of Sociology.* Vol. 30 (2004), pp. 173-197.

Skog, Ole-Jorgen. "Studying Cultural Change: Were the Changes in Alcohol and Coffee Consumption in the Nineteenth Century a Case of Beverage Substitution?" *Acta Sociologica*. Vol. 49, No. 3 (Sep., 2006), pp. 287-302.

Super, John. "Food and History." *Journal of Social History,* Vol. 36, No. 1 (Autumn, 2002). pp. 165-178.

Trentmann, Frank. "Beyond Consumerism: New Historical Perspectives on Consumption." *Journal of Contemporary History.* Vol. 39, No. 3 (Jul., 2004), pp. 373-401.

Tombs, Isabelle and Robert. *That Sweet Enemy: The French and the British from the Sun King to the Present.* London: William Heinemann, 2006.

Thirsk, Joan. *Food in Early Modern England: Phases, Fads, Fashions 1500-1760.* London: Continuum Books, 2007.

Visser, Margaret. *The Rituals of Dinner: The Origins, Evolution, Eccentricities, and Meaning of Table Manners.* New York: Grove Weidenfeld, 1991.

Wallis, Patrick. "Apprenticeship and Training in Premodern England." *The Journal of Economic History*. Vol. 68, No. 3 (Sep., 2008), pp. 832-861.

Wheaton, Barbara Ketcham. *Savoring the Past: The French Kitchen and Table from 1300 to 1789.* New York: Scribner, 1983.

Willan, Anne, et al. *The Cookbook Library: Four Centuries of the Cooks, Writers, and Recipes That Made the Modern Cookbook.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012.

Wilson, C. Anne. *Food and Drink in Britain: From the Stone Age to the 19th Century.* Chicago: Academy Publishers, 1991.

APPENDIX

When available, I only used first editions of published cookbooks for this project. However, I was limited to what could be found electronically and occasionally was forced to use a later edition of a cookbook. Many of the cookbooks went through numerous editions, sometimes without any significant changes. A more complete analysis would need to be done on a case by case basis. In the case of Hannah Glasse's *The Art of Cookery*, the book's twenty one editions did included additions of new recipes after each new printing. Until the eleventh edition published in 1774, *The Art of Cookery* did not include bills of fare as Glasse believed it too presumptuous to tell ladies how to set their table. The 1774 edition was published after Glasse's death and publishers apparently decided they could then add an appendix with bills of fare for each month. Presumably, most cookbooks that published multiple editions would go through similar processes, with only additions to the content of the book being made and very few subtractions.

The following table is a visual representation of how long each cookbook was in print. Not every new edition listed a number; most publishers preferring to write "A New Edition" to describe it instead. In these instances, I tried to place the year of publication in sequence with the other editions even if the year is listed under a number that is not entirely accurate. Also, I was not able to find the years of every edition for every cookbook so I listed each edition that could be found with my limited resources.

TITLE AND AUTHOR	1ST EDITION	2ND EDITION	3RD EDITION	4TH EDITION	5TH EDITION	6TH EDITION	7TH EDITION	8TH EDITION	9TH EDITION	10TH EDITION	11TH EDITION	12TH EDITION
The House-Keeper's Pocket Book, Harrison	1733	1739		1748		1755	1760		1777			
The Compleat Housewife, Smith[1]		1728	1729	1730	1732	1734	1736		1739	1741	1742	
The Art of Cookery, Glasse[2]	1747	1747	1748	1751	1755	1758	1760	1763	1767	1770	1774	1778
The Young Woman's Companion, Johnson	1753	1755	1765	1766	1769							
A New and Easy Method of Cookery, Cleland	1755	1759										
The Art of Cookery, Thacker	1758											
A Complete System of Cookery, Verral	1759											
The British Housewife, Bradley[3]	1760											
The Lady's, Housewife's and Cookmaid's Assistant, Taylor	1769	1778										
The Experienced English House-keeper, Raffald	1769	1771				1782				1786		
The Professed Cook, Clermont		1769	1776									
The Lady's Assistant, Mason	1773		1777	1778		1787	1800	1801				
The London Art of Cookery, Farley	1783	1784		1787		1789	1792	1796	1800	1801		1811
The Lady's Complete Guide, Cole	1788											
The Housekeeper's Valuable Present, Abbot	1790											

[1] I found an eighteenth edition that was published in 1773 and a facsimile edition published in 1968.

[2] The last edition I was able to find of Glasse was published in 1796 and was labeled as "A New Edition" but was at least the 21st edition since the 20th edition was published in 1791.

[3] A facsimile edition of this book, with an introduction by editor Gilly Lehman, was published in 1996.

Every Woman Her Own House Keeper, Perkins	1790			1796								
The Practice of Cookery, Frazer	1791	1795	1800				1820					
The Universal Cook, Collingwood and Woollams	1792	1797		1806								
The New Experienced English-Housekeeper, Martin	1795	1800										
Mrs. Taylor's Family Companion, Taylor	1795											
An Economical and New Method of Cookery, Melroe	1798											
Culina Famulatrix Medicina, Hunter	1806											
A New System of Domestic Cookery, Rundell[4]	1808	1810	1816	1823	1840	1842						
The Cook's Oracle, Kitchiner[5]	1817	1822	1823	1827	1829	1830	1836	1843				

[4] This book was published in both England and the United States. Only editions published in London are included here.
[5] *The Cook's Oracle* was published in several different places, including London, Edinburgh, New York, and Boston.